



EARLHAM COLLEGE
LIBRARY





THE WAR-METHOD AND THE PEACE-METHOD

An Historical Contrast

A BOOK ON DISARMAMENT

by the

Same Author and Publishers

entitled

*“Preparedness: The American Versus
the Military Programme”*

It is based upon the gigantic efforts made before and during the World War to preserve the peace, or to achieve victory and justice, by means of adequate preparations for war, on one side, and of adequate preparations for peace, on the other.

Octavo, 271 pages. Price, \$3.00

The War-Method and The Peace-Method

An Historical Contrast

By

WILLIAM I. HULL, PH.D., F. R. HIST. S.

Professor of History and International Relations in Swarthmore College

*Author of "The Two Hague Conferences," "The New Peace
Movement," "The Monroe Doctrine," "Preparedness," etc.*



NEW YORK

CHICAGO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON

AND

EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXXIX, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

JX
1938
H8

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 851 Cass Street
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 99 George Street

This Book is Gratefully Dedicated
To
THE HONOURABLE HERBERT HOOVER
President of the United States of America
Whose Administration is adding an
Illustrious Chapter to the History of the
Substitution of the Peace-Method for the
War-Method in Relations among Nations

48598

PREFACE

THE historical contrast in this book between the war-method and the peace-method of dealing with relations between and among nations results, frankly, in favour of the peace-method. The author is conscious of holding a brief for this method; and yet it is not, he believes, wholly one-sided like a lawyer's brief, but is rather a historian's brief in which the facts about the use of both methods are permitted to speak for themselves. When these facts are fairly weighed in Clio's scales, without either the glamour of the sword or the prejudices of peace being thrown in on either side, the balance falls decisively on the side of the peace-method. The author cannot prevent this result, and he is frankly glad of it, although his gladness is tainted by no twinge of conscience for having knowingly concealed, distorted or exaggerated the facts in the historic story.

The champions of the war-method, it is true, advance several arguments in favour of it, and against the peace-method, which they believe or hope that the facts of history will substantiate. Among these are, first, that the war-method has been and always will be necessary because of the unchanging character of human nature. To this it may be replied that human nature has greatly changed and is changing from generation to generation; that even though it did not change, it is quite able, even in its alleged unregenerate state, to achieve the substitution of the peace-method for the war-method; and that simply because the latter has been resorted to so often is no valid proof either that it was necessary in the past or will be necessary in the future. To assert this, is to commit the fallacy of *non sequitur*, or to attempt to prove a negative.

Our war-method champions also insist that the war-method alone would have been effective in the settlement of some disputes, like the Anglo-American Problem of 1776 and the Slavery Problem of 1861. Here, of course, we are left without a definition of "effective," and meet again with the assertion that the peace-method, which was not persisted in, would have failed. If effectiveness is viewed from the field of morality and justice, sages like Benjamin Franklin have declared that there never was a righteous war, nor an unrighteous peace; while

from the point of view of practical politics, it must be conceded, that Canada shows how the English colonies to the south of it *might* have become self-governing and even independent, without resorting to war, and also that if they had remained with the Mother Country their slaves *might* have been emancipated in 1830 and their union, based on strong economic and cultural and stronger political ties, *might* have remained undisturbed in 1861.

Admitting that it is not the war-method itself that makes peace after war is ended, its champions nevertheless insist that war is necessary before statesmen can meet around a table and negotiate peace. But this again is a pure assumption, and history suggests that peace settlements dictated by victors in war are usually and perhaps always vitiated by injustice and become a prolific source of more war.

As to war being the cause of much good, as well as evil, it is quite possible that the good results which have sometimes followed war are not due to it, but to other and wholly different causes. Truth is not usually to be found on the surface of things; and in this case it is peculiarly easy to overlook the maxim of *post hoc, sed non propter hoc*. Even though war did itself bring good in its train, the same might be said of slavery, smallpox, or great conflagrations; and yet so vast are their evils along with the good that the world strives its utmost to get rid of them and achieve the good results in some other way. Even *defeat* in war,—perhaps more frequently than victory,—is accompanied by good results; and yet what advocate of the war-method would welcome defeat? The very fact that it is *our* victory and *their* defeat which is considered to be the source of good, makes the argument non-acceptable.

But enough of *a priori* reasoning. Will the reader kindly turn to a candid consideration of the facts of history and reach his own conclusions after he has carefully considered her verdict? Perhaps then he will agree with some warriors as eminent and experienced as General Grant that there never was a war which could not have been prevented by a resort to the peace-method. But should he still hold with the war-method as justified in the past, will he not concede that the peace-method might be given *a better chance* to succeed in the future?

W. I. H.

CONTENTS

I. THE VERDICT OF HISTORY	11
1. EGYPT	13
2. MESOPOTAMIA	14
3. THE JEWS	16
4. PERSIA	17
5. INDIA	19
6. CHINA	19
7. JAPAN	20
8. THE MONGOLS	22
9. THE ÆGEANS	24
10. THE GREEKS	25
11. THE MACEDONIANS	27
12. THE PHOENICIANS AND CARTHAGINIANS . .	29
13. THE ROMANS	30
14. THE EASTERN ROMAN EMPIRE	34
15. THE GOTHs	36
16. THE LOMBARDS	39
17. THE VANDALS	39
18. THE HUNS	40
19. THE FRANKS	42
20. THE NORTHMEN	44
21. THE ARABS	45
22. THE SELJUK TURKS AND THE CRUSADERS .	46
23. THE OTTOMAN TURKS	48
24. THE BULGARS	52
25. THE SERBS	54
26. ROUMANIA	55

27.	POLAND	57
28.	BOHEMIA (CZECHO-SLOVAKIA)	58
29.	RUSSIA	60
30.	SWEDEN	64
31.	NORWAY	67
32.	DENMARK	69
33.	HOLLAND	72
34.	BELGIUM	77
35.	SWITZERLAND	80
36.	SPAIN	84
37.	PORTUGAL	93
38.	ITALY	97
39.	AUSTRIA	112
40.	HUNGARY	119
41.	GERMANY	125
42.	FRANCE	147
43.	ENGLAND AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE	195
	(a) Scotland	206
	(b) Wales	217
	(c) Ireland	219
	(d) England's Civil Wars	231
	(e) England's Wars with France	241
	(f) The British Empire	253
44.	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	277
45.	LATIN AMERICA (TWENTY REPUBLICS)	300
II.	THE WAR-METHOD: A SUMMARY	322
III.	THE PEACE-METHOD: A SUMMARY	347

I

THE VERDICT OF HISTORY

FROM the beginning of man's life on earth he has struggled against cold, hunger, darkness and disease. To protect his life and to procure food, he began to *fight* with the birds of the air and the beasts of the forest and the plain. After he learned how to master the lower animals, he tamed them and has continued down to the present day to use them as servants or as food. He began to fight also with his fellowmen, and in spite of civilization and religion he still kills them for one reason or another and in a variety of ways.

But struggle and fighting are not *war*. War began when one people banded their able-bodied men together into armies, which set out to kill the warriors and chieftains of another people, and in case of victory over them killed the rest of the defeated people or carried them away into slavery. Through the centuries, war has developed into a science, a profession, a world-wide system; and in our time, with our mastery of the chemical, pathological, mechanical and other forces of nature it has become even more destructive of human life than in the early days of savage warfare. On the field of battle and in the homes of victors and vanquished alike, war's Angel of Death summons his millions. The burden of slavery is no longer imposed in the civilized world; but defeated peoples, and victorious ones as well, are obliged to carry for generations a heavy load of debt, poverty and disease. For poverty, pestilence and famine follow always and everywhere in the footsteps of "the dogs of war."

Peace, the opposite of war, is not merely the absence of war but, like war, it is a system, a method, an organized

means of settling disputes between nations. To a far greater extent than war, it requires the utmost ingenuity and moral devotion of men to organize and apply it with entire success. War has been so familiar to men since the dawn of history, and peace has been so difficult for them to understand and utilize, that there is a wide-spread pessimistic belief that war is inevitable and that peace can be achieved only after a long, slow process of revolutionizing and transforming human nature itself, as well as social institutions.

Both reason and experience, however, when listened to attentively, teach the fallacy of this belief. History in particular shows not only the ferocity and folly of war as a method, but also the naturalness and sufficiency of peace as a method, even with fundamental human nature such as it is. Disputes among nations as among individuals are inevitable, until we attain the millennium; but meanwhile the simple question is, Shall we resort to war or to peace as the method of settling them?

History is a very wide and complicated study, and it requires much effort to master even its rudimentary lessons. Unfortunately, the writing of history has usually taken the form of selecting the relatively trivial but picturesque incidents of the past and presenting them in a dramatic or partisan and wholly superficial fashion. In most books on history, the reader finds a great mass of unrelated and unsystematized facts presented in chronological but not logical or even topical order; hence he finds it difficult or impossible to disentangle the many threads of the historic story and acquire clear and convincing impressions of each of them or of the story as a whole. Especially has the story of war and peace been written in confused, or prejudiced, or wilfully distorted fashion, and smeared over by a veneer of false glamour or sickly sentimentalism designed to cater to the reader's supposed taste for supernationalism, for the romantic, and for the mock-heroic.

The object of the brief historical sketch of war and peace presented in this book is to single out this one thread of the

human story and follow it in simple fashion from the dawn of history throughout historic times to our own day, in which we hope and believe we are in the full dawn of world peace and justice.

It has been said that happy are those nations in whose annals there has been no war; but alas, such nations are rare indeed, and so universal and continuous has been war that its historian has a task of enormous magnitude before him, should he attempt to describe it in full detail. The history of peace, too, has been long, rich and varied. But it has been very largely side-tracked in most historical treatises, which have given the main line to "drum and trumpet history." To do full justice to it would require even more time and space than that demanded by the history of war. Fortunately for the author of this sketch, his task was to write only an outline of the war-method and the peace-method. His chief difficulty has been to select from the vast number of details that clamoured for admission to the book only those which were necessary as stepping-stones across its ocean. Thus the path which the book marks out is a straight and narrow one, and its author sincerely hopes that it leads always and only to the simple truth.

Egypt

Egypt is a gift of the Nile. The river rises in the mountains of Eastern Africa, brings down with it fertile soil, overflows its banks in the narrow, cliff-enclosed valley of Egypt, and deposits its gifts of soil and irrigation for the uses of men.

Six or eight thousand years ago, men began to grow wheat in the valley and develop towns, prosperity, science, religion, art. Kings and emperors arose, and wars began.

During the four thousand years before Alexander and his Greeks put an end to Egyptian independence, more than thirty dynasties of kings and emperors had ruled over the people. These rulers had carried on wars against all their

14 THE WAR-METHOD AND PEACE-METHOD

neighbours:—the Ethiopians, Arabs, Syrians, Jews, Hittites, Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians; and since the Greek conquest, Egypt has been conquered and ruled by the Romans, Arabs, Turks, French and English.

Its early rulers desired to glorify themselves in the eyes of the people of their time and to preserve their name and fame through all the future. Hence they built in their own honour and to record their evil deeds, great palaces, temples, tombs, labyrinths, statues and pyramids. Seventy of their pyramids are still visible, thirty of them are fairly well preserved, and the largest of them covers more than thirteen acres, is over five hundred feet high, and to build it required more than 100,000 men toiling under their task-masters' lash for twenty years! The builder of this giant tomb was King Khufu or Cheops, but he is now and has been for centuries merely a *name*,—merely one name among thousands of rulers who, for their own glorification, imposed unmeasured hardships and toil upon millions of their fellow-mortals and led millions more to mutual slaughter.

Meanwhile, the unknown and uncounted masses of the people toiled on, generation after generation, doing the best they could to provide food and the other necessities of life and to make life sweeter, easier and better. They laid the foundations of commerce, science, art, religion, writing, the philosophy of Plato, and the monotheism of Moses and Christianity. But war and imperialism (of their own kings and others) were too strong for them in the end, and in spite of the civilization which they had so patiently, persistently and nobly developed, they became subject to other peoples, the victims of wars, pestilence and famine, and for centuries have struggled, almost despairingly, for a bare and bleak existence.

Mesopotamia

Ancient Mesopotamia, like Egypt, owed its prosperity to the life-giving virtues of its rivers. In the valley between the Euphrates and the Tigris, men began almost as many

thousands of years ago as in Egypt to grow grain and develop civilization.

The wedge-shaped letters (cuneiform) which they invented have recorded some of their story since more than thirty centuries ago. This story, too, is largely a story of war, conquest, imperialism, on one side, and a striving for peace and civilization on the other.

One people after another have come into the marvellous valley to make it their home. Sumerians, Akkadians, Amonites, Elamites, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Turks, and Englishmen, have each and all come with their armies, and some of them with their people, to settle and dwell in "the land between the Rivers."

Some of these people did much to promote human welfare in many ways, and to make of Mesopotamia a kind of lighthouse of civilization which shed its beneficent rays upon the surrounding darkness of barbarism. But parallel with this peaceful industry and law-giving, and undermining and nullifying it, flowed an unending stream of warfare and conquest. The Assyrian rulers were probably the worst of the warrior-rulers who have turned this "Garden of Eden" into a desert, a vast cemetery, and a heap of ruins. As the poet, Byron, describes one of them:

*"The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold,
And his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold;
And the sheen of their spears was like stars on the sea,
When the blue wave rolls nightly on dark Galilee."*

In spite, and largely because, of their cruel ferocity and their soldiers, as numerous as "the leaves of the forest when Summer is green," they and their hosts and all their deeds have "melted like snow in the glance of the Lord!"

But alas for the progress and happiness of mankind, which had such fair promise in the wondrous valley so many centuries ago and which might have attained great heights during successive centuries of peace! They too came tumbling into the abyss, carried along by the mad orgy of battle

16 THE WAR-METHOD AND PEACE-METHOD

and conquest; and their fair hopes and possibilities of human welfare have crumbled into dust like the stately temples, the royal palaces and the lordly tombs which the kings and warriors built to perpetuate their glory. The pomp of Babylon and Nineveh has vanished; the lion and the lizard keep the courts where captains and kings once triumphed; the name of Slave and Sultan is forgot; but the real tragedy has been that the golden opportunities given for man's advancement by the God of Peace in the fair "land between the Rivers" have been wantonly sacrificed age after age upon the altars of the Gods of War.

The Jews

The Jews were one of many peoples who made their homes in Syria, the land between the Valley of the Nile and the Valley of the Tigris and Euphrates. By means of irrigation, agriculture was made to flourish and populous cities were built up as centers of political power and civilized life. But the neighbours of the Syrian peoples fought one another generation after generation across the Syrian lands, and the Syrians themselves engaged in almost perpetual strife, so that war constantly destroyed the gifts of nature and the fruits of human industry, and the potentially fertile Syrian land has been for centuries almost a desert.

Among the Syrian peoples, the most famous were the Hebrews or Jews, who, after generations of nomadic life and dependent sojourn in Egypt, made their home in Palestine. The Scriptures, which record many incidents in their story, are a household book in all the continents and many lands to-day; and it is a significant comment on the foolishness of man and the wisdom of God that the Scriptures of the Hebrews, their most precious gift to men, were written, not in the days of their pride and power, but during and after the period of their exile and captivity among the Babylonians.

In the Scriptures, as among the people, there were two persistent ideals ever seeking realization. One of these was

the ideal of military conquest and political supremacy over other peoples; the other was the ideal of peace and good will among men. The first of these led through fourteen centuries to many bloody and barbarous wars with their Syrian neighbours, to alliances with one or other of the great powers in Egypt or Mesopotamia, and finally to their own conquest, captivity and dispersal. The second ideal was expressed in the great command of Moses, "*Thou shalt not kill,*" and in the noble peace-messages of Isaiah and Micah. It has been throughout the centuries and throughout the world the great, shining goal of that time when swords shall be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning-hooks, and when all nations shall come up to the House of the Lord (that is, to the International Court of Justice) to be judged by the laws of man conforming to the laws of God, and when men shall learn war no more.

Israel's transient military and political power went down nineteen centuries ago in blood and flames; her capital, Jerusalem, has been for centuries in the hands of Pagans and Moslems; her people are dispersed in alien lands; but her sublime ideal of World Peace and World Justice has gone shining on through the centuries of darkness and warfare, to be realized now, please God, in our own day and generation.

Persia

Coming up out of the deserts and highlands of Central Asia, the barbarous Persians fell upon the civilized peoples of the Assyrian and Babylonian Empires,—weakened as these were by centuries of militarism,—captured their great cities of Nineveh and Babylon, pushed on into Egypt, and brought all the ancient Orient west of the Indus under their sway.

But the bloody history of war repeated itself with the Persians also, and with the same result. For a mere span of two hundred years, they fought their petty wars and lorded it over their war-exhausted subjects; and then a new

band of barbarian warriors under the leadership of Alexander of Macedon defeated their armies and conquered their own and their subject lands.

During their two centuries of rule, they had done something to revive and adopt the arts and sciences of civilized life which their predecessors in the great valleys had toiled so painfully during ten thousand years to build up and had then torn down. They did manage to preserve much of this ancient civilization; but the Greek barbarians feared, strangely enough, that, if the Persians should conquer them, their own so-called civilization would go down under the Persians' so-called barbarism. And yet when the Greeks followed Alexander into the lands which the Persians had made their own, they found and appreciated the ancient civilization of Western Asia and tried in turn to adopt and adapt it to their own needs and desires.

As among the Jews and so many other early peoples, so among the Persians a great teacher, Zoroaster, stands out in preëminent importance. He proclaimed one God, the Good Spirit of the Universe, struggling against the Powers of Evil, and summoned all his followers to forsake all other warfare and enlist in the struggle of Good against Evil, not against fellowmen and human lives, but against the evil thoughts and desires that lie in every human heart. Not the great and good Zoroaster, however, but Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, Xerxes: these are the idle names of warriors, of conquerors and conquered, which are the only relics in the popular mind of ancient Persia's "greatness."

For five hundred years longer, the remnant of the Persian people and their allies struggled against the invasion of Greek power and ideas; and then for four hundred years, they resisted the Romans; until at last the Mohammedans, —Arabs, and Turks,—conquered their lands and people and imposed upon them their culture and their religious faith. To-day, Persia is a fifth-rate, backward kingdom, one of the countless victims of war, struggled over for a generation before the World War by Russia and Great Britain, and

apparently doomed to become a pawn of the British Empire, the threshold or door-mat of the British Empire of India.

India

Beyond Persia, and beyond the civilized peoples of Western Asia, lay the continental mass of India with its teeming millions. During six thousand years, the history of India is marked by tribal wars and petty tyrannies founded upon temporary military success. Almost the only bright spots in the dark picture are the advances in law and religion made, not by any of the "conquerors," but under the inspired leadership of a peace-loving king, Manu, and a peace-loving prince, Buddha, whose professed followers now number one-quarter of the human race.

Alexander's ambition led him to tread only on the fringe of the garment of mighty India, and for eighteen centuries longer it continued the unknown land of mystery and luxuries. Then the adventurous prow of Vasco da Gama found its way through untraversed seas around Africa and on to the coast of Malabar and Calcutta. During the past four hundred years, India has been fought for by Portuguese, Dutch, French and British, and it has supplied countless victims of foreign and civil wars to be sacrificed on the altar of Mars and Cæsar. To-day, a part of the British Empire, India is stirring uneasily under her foreign yoke and seeking for the path of independence and self-government. Whether this path will be one of British concession, of military violence, of Bolshevist revolution, or of passive resistance under the leadership of the great Indian prophet, Gandhi, only time can reveal.

China

Beyond India, in the river-valleys of the Yang-tse and the Hoangho, the great people of China entered upon their struggle for a civilized life of peace and prosperity. Their brief "golden age" was followed by long centuries of aggressive wars, political decay and moral chaos. Even their

Great Wall and their countless defensive wars failed to beat off the Huns, Mongols, Tatars, Turks and other barbarous hordes which poured in from the Mongolian deserts; while civil war between the North and the South added its horrors and confusion.

Into China's darkness, as into Persia's and India's, there shone the light of a rational and peace-teaching religion. Lao-tse, the mystic, and Confucius, the practical moralist and utilitarian, did their utmost to root out the seeds of militarism from the Chinese mind and to implant within it the love of peace. To-day, their professed followers number another quarter of the Earth's inhabitants; and their peaceful teachings have been most potent in enabling the Chinese people to survive the centuries of attacks made upon them by outside barbarians, and even to absorb the barbarian invaders one after the other into their life and culture.

A century ago, British guns blasted a way through China's wall of exclusion; and during the past hundred years, the "Great Powers" of the West have rivalled and fought with one another for the right of "civilizing" China, or, rather, for the taking of her outlying provinces and the exploitation of her natural resources and her labour.

Fortunately for the rest of the world, "heathen" China's three hundred and fifty million people have not yet become militarized under the precept, example and coercion of the "Christian" Occident; and it is devoutly to be hoped and striven for that war and preparations for war shall disappear from off the Earth while China's millions are being industrialized and civilized in the best Western sense of the word, and before they adopt in self-defense the spirit and engines of militarism.

Japan

The history of Japan begins with the invasion of the islands by a people from the Asiatic coast, and the conquest of the savage Ainus. This conquest evidently required a long time, for the Ainus still rise in revolt from time to

time. Other wars among tribal chieftains followed, until the centralized national government of the Mikados was finally established.

Japan's insular location saved her from many wars which afflicted the continent during the Middle Ages and modern times. But her troops invaded Corea and partly conquered it, and she was thus brought into close touch with China, from whom she learned many of the arts of civilization. But the policy of foreign conquest, on which the Mikados entered, was followed in Japan itself by the overthrow of the national government and the establishment of a military autocracy (the Shogunate), which ruled for nearly thirteen centuries.

During the long period of military feudalism and of civil war between the rival families and factions of the Shogunate, the social advance of the people became stagnant and their poverty and misery most deplorable. And yet it was during this very period that Marco Polo was writing golden fairy-tales about Japan, and Christopher Columbus was striving his utmost to come into touch with the Grand Khan and the Great Mikado in the islands of the West Indies!

At last, in 1853, across the vast Pacific from the New World Republic came Commodore Perry; treaties of friendship and commerce were made with the United States and the powers of Europe, and Japan entered upon that marvellously rapid revolution in industry, science and government, which is one of the wonders of recent history. Most unfortunately for Japan and the world, however, there came with Western civilization the poison of modern militarism and navalism, for which the ruling classes of Japan were only too eager. With the precept, example and aid of the "Christian and civilized" powers, Japan became a "Great Power" in the world of diplomacy and war.

During the past fifty years, Japan has fought a civil war, suppressed several revolts, defeated China, made a naval alliance on equal terms with Great Britain, fought a frightful war in the Chinese province of Manchuria and on the

ocean with Russia, which cost Japan alone \$2,000,000,000 and 100,000 lives; and during the recent World War drove the Germans out of the Chinese province of Shantung. So menacing to the peace of the Far East and the Pacific had become the great power of Japan and the West's rivalries, that the United States called a conference at Washington in 1921-1922 and succeeded in checking the rivalry in armaments among the three greatest naval powers,—the British Empire, the United States and Japan,—and induced the British and Japanese to abrogate their treaty of alliance and the Japanese to withdraw their troops from Siberia and Shantung. In this conference, also, it was agreed that any future disputes relating to affairs in the Pacific should be brought to a conference of the great powers, with the hope that they might be settled by peaceful means.

Thus, the militaristic development of Japan, which received its greatest impulse from the Western powers, has been checked and her great resources deflected into the development of peaceful industry. But this beneficent result will be permanent only if the United States and other Western powers will themselves refrain from the building up of great armaments and from a policy of aggression and conquest in the Far East. The alternative of War, or Law and Coöperation, Japan is amply able and willing to accept: which will the "Christian and civilized" Occident permit her to choose?

The Mongols

For two thousand years after the dawn of history, the Mongols were known as a great body of unorganized tribesmen, subsisting on their flocks in the vast plains of Central Asia, and making uncounted raids from time to time upon their neighbours. Against these raids was built the famous Chinese Wall, 1400 miles in length, from 15 to 30 feet high, and as many broad; and this, together with the payment of tribute, appears to have held the Mongols in check, as far as the people of China were concerned.

But fourteen centuries later, they had learned enough of

Chinese civilization, without imbibing its peace principles, to organize their entire people in battle array and, swarming out of their old home, to conquer a part of China and destroy the Khorasmian kingdom of the Persians. In twelve years of warfare, Jenghis Khan, their military leader, is said to have conquered the largest territory ever subdued by a single hand, and to have caused the slaughter of nearly nineteen million human beings! Thus, "uncivilized" though he was, he emulated the record of his "civilized" successors of 1914, who in one-third as many years caused the death of twice as many victims! He did this, too, not even in pursuit of any lofty ideal, but in fulfillment of his motto to destroy all cities as the haunts of slaves and luxury, and to permit his people's herds to feed freely upon grass whose green verdure should be free from the dusty feet of townsmen!

The successors of this "mighty conqueror" carried devastating death and paralyzing terror through Armenia, Georgia, Asia Minor, southern and central Russia (where they attempted to live and rule for 250 years); defeated the Poles and Germans, ravaged Hungary, conquered Persia and Mesopotamia and put an end to the Arabian Caliphate of Bagdad. One of them, Kublai Khan, completed the conquest of China, and his fleets were only prevented from an invasion of Japan by a terrific storm.

Again, as so many times in history, these Mongol or Tartar raiders, victorious on many "glorious" fields of battle, were themselves conquered by the superior culture of the conquered, were absorbed in the larger populations whom they claimed to have subdued, and the son of a Chinese labourer easily replaced the last of their shadowy rulers on the imperial throne of China. But again, a century later, the tigerish lust for battle broke out in another descendant of Jenghis Khan, Timour Lenk, or Tamerlane; and out of Mongolia he led his hordes of warriors on an errand of destruction. For fifty years, Tamerlane's career of conquest and slaughter lasted, and Central Asia, Persia, Afghanistan,

Baluchistan, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Georgia, Asia Minor, and Syria suffered death and desolation at his hands.

In the irony of fate, it was chiefly other Mongol Tatar or Turkish "conquerors" who fell victims to Tamerlane's sword. For example, in Russia, Persia and Mesopotamia it was the remnants of the former Mongol rulers who went down before him and supplied him with the 90,000 human heads which he built in pyramidal form on the ruins of Bagdad; while in Syria and Asia Minor it was the Ottoman Turks who suffered most at his hands and supplied the skulls for his pyramids of death erected on the ruins of Nicæa, Prusa, Smyrna, Aleppo and Damascus.

But satiated with human blood, and weary of futile "conquests," Tamerlane died in his capital of Samarcand, realizing that his fancied rule over many lands and peoples was but a fleeting shadow; and immediately after his death his people disappeared into the desert or among "the conquered" and their boasted power vanished like the clouds in their desert home. To-day, Mongolia is a mere bone of contention among its neighbours, Russia, China and Japan, who desire all that Mongolia has to offer *except* its age-long lesson of the futility of war.

The Ægeans

Asia, mother of nations and cradle of civilization, bequeathed her lust for battle, along with her people and her culture, to her younger sister, Europe. In the Eastern Mediterranean, on the islands and coasts of the Ægean Sea, arose a profoundly interesting people, who are now called "Ægeans," but about whom only recent years have revealed a scanty knowledge. Probably borrowing the rudiments of their civilization from Asia and Egypt, they developed it to an astonishing height and achieved marvels in the realm of industry, art and government.

But the virus of militarism and imperialism entered into their body politic also, and vestiges are found of far-reaching naval empires with their capitals at Mycenæ,

Troy, and Cnossus on the Isle of Crete. Weakened by warfare and autocracy, demoralized probably, also, by cankering luxury, they fell a prey to the invading barbarians whom we call Hellenes. Their power was broken, and their very cities were destroyed; but their civilization proved too strong for their conquerors, and lived on as the basis of that remarkable culture which the world has marvelled at for twenty-two centuries under the name of Greek.

The Greeks

Coming out from Central Asia, down around both ends of the Black Sea, the barbarous Greeks, or Hellenes, fell upon the civilized peoples in Western Asia and South-eastern Europe, and settled with their flocks and simple implements in the seats of ancient culture on both sides of the Ægean Sea.

They were evidently a peculiarly adoptive or assimilative people, and soon added to their barbarous practices the arts and sciences of the richly civilized life amidst which they found themselves. For centuries, doubtless, this ancient world of culture lived through a period which might be called the Dark and Middle Ages; but as the Greeks became more and more capable of appreciating and adapting the ancient culture, there was a great Revival of Learning, a great Renaissance, which blossomed forth in those splendid creations of architecture, sculpture, painting, literature, philosophy and science which we associate with the names of Ictinus and Phidias, Praxiteles and Polygnotus, Herodotus, Thucydides, Homer, Æschylus and Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes, Socrates, Anaxagoras, Plato and Aristotle, and a score of illustrious others.

But the setting of all these brilliant jewels was by no means pure gold. Human slavery, infanticide, the degradation of woman, the corruption of youth, the destruction of democracy, and the curse of almost ceaseless war debased the metallic setting of this brilliant civilization, and finally covered its jewels by a heap of ruins and decay which

needed another Renaissance of a dozen centuries later to revive and restore.

The Greeks followed their generations of war upon the earlier occupants of the Ægean lands by a series of wars upon one another. Hellenes against Pelasgians, Dorians and Ionians against Achæans and Ætolians, Thessalians against Æolians, three wars of the Peloponnesians against the Mesenians (covering at intervals a period of three hundred years),—such is a portion of the bloody list on the threshold of their history.

The Persians and other civilized peoples of western Asia determined to check this bloody career of the Greeks before it should be turned upon inland and southern Asia. Accordingly they launched three expeditions by land and by sea against them. But this "war to end war," like all others of its kind, proved futile; and then the Persians resorted to diplomacy and bribery, and found it all too easy to revive the wars of the Greeks upon one another. Greek greed responded to Persian gold, and the fires of internecine strife broke out with redoubled vigour. The Athenians and Megarians fought the Spartans, Corinthians and Æginetans; the Phocians and Locrians fought the Thebans; the Athenians, at the head of a naval alliance or empire of other Greek cities, fought a bloody and exhausting war of thirty years against Sparta and a league of land allies; after the overthrow of Athens, Sparta ruled and fought with an iron hand, until the Spartans went down before the Thebans, who were themselves soon overthrown by the Macedonians.

Thus, *War*, *Pestilence* and *Famine* are written large over the history of ancient Greece, and her fair works of art and learning are scorched and blackened by the flames of battle and the blood of slaughtered multitudes. Now and again the Goddess of Peace and Wisdom raised her head and endeavoured to lead the feet of men back into the paths of peace and reason. A restriction was set at times upon the ferocities of war; and amphictyonies, or Holy Leagues, were created to protect the sanctuaries of the gods and their

devotees. But even this peace of the gods was far from being the Peace of God; for it was itself *enforced*, by the leagues or by one of their appointed agents against a recalcitrant member. This attempt to end war by war naturally stirred up new alliances and greater war, and finally ended in the conquest and subjugation of all the Greeks by the appointed agent of the Amphictyony of Delphi, Philip of Macedon.

The Macedonians

King Philip of Macedon had been sent in his youth from his barbarous home in the north of Hellas, as a hostage for the good behaviour of his people, to the city of Thebes in Central Greece. Here he had learned to appreciate the life of civilized men; but he also learned from the Theban generals, Pelopidas and Epaminondas, who had conquered Sparta, the arts of "civilized" war.

Returning as king to his native land, he put these arts into successful practice, first against the cities of the north, and then against the city of Thebes and the rest of Greece. Summoning representatives from all the Greek cities to meet him at Corinth, he was accepted by them as the military dictator of Greece; and, to soothe their injured pride and to prevent revolts against himself, he promised to lead the armies of the various states against the "hereditary Persian foe." But Philip was murdered on the eve of his departure for Asia, and his domination of Greece and attempt against Persia were left to the hands of his son Alexander.

Alexander, too, had been educated in the arts of civilized life; indeed, his chief teacher of these was Aristotle, the greatest of Greek philosophers and scientists. But the political and military ambition of Alexander caused him to turn his back upon the precepts of his sage adviser and to plunge into a career of conquest and "glory." At the age of twenty, he quenched in blood the revolt of Thebes, Athens and Sparta, and then, leaving Greece under the military heel of a vicegerent, crossed the Hellespont into Asia.

In a series of battles and sieges, the military autocracy of Persia, decayed in every fibre, went down like a house of cards before the defection of its subject peoples, the military genius of Alexander, and the fresh vigour of his troops. Before the youthful conqueror had attained the age of thirty, he had subdued Western Asia and Egypt to the confines of India and the African desert, and had wept when his soldiers refused to follow him farther,—“new worlds to conquer.”

In the midst of his career of warfare and indulgence in pleasure, super-egotism and brutal deeds, one lofty ideal of Alexander's great teacher returned to dominate the last days of his life. This was the ideal of a world-culture and a world-people in which the best blood and the best elements of civilization of Asia and the Greeks should be intermingled. During the last year and a half before his death, Alexander entered on the realization of this far-reaching scheme. He and his soldiers set the example of the amalgamation of the races by marrying Asiatic wives; and he encouraged the coming of Greeks to settle in the old cities of the Orient and to found new ones, where the Hellenic and the Oriental elements of civilization could become intermingled.

Carried on by Alexander's successors, this ideal might have become of great and lasting benefit to the people of both Greece and Asia; but the experiment was vitiated at the start by the militaristic imperialism upon which it was based. At the time of his death, Alexander is believed to have been preparing a military expedition for the conquest of the Carthaginians and Romans in the Western Mediterranean, and for the enforced union of the entire civilized world within his world-empire. But he was cut off in the flower of his manhood and his world-empire crumbled into fragments in Asia and never was born in Europe. His name and fame have come down to posterity under the title of Alexander the Great; but the greatness attributed to him is merely that of the long and futile list of “Conquerors.”

The successors of Alexander were his generals, who set up their military autocracies in the various lands which he had conquered, and engaged in a confused and complicated scramble of divisions and subdivisions, of revolts and civil wars, which ended finally in the emergence of four monarchies in Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor and Greece. These monarchies lasted about 200 years, and were finally conquered and annexed by Rome.

The historical importance of the kingdoms based upon the Macedonian-Persian empire of Alexander lies in their opportunity for the spread of Hellenic or Hellenistic culture throughout the Mediterranean world; and there was a considerable amount of colonization and amalgamation of arts, literature and learning. But, from their foundation to their fall, the sword cast its shadow upon them, at home and from abroad; militarism, autocracy and the deepest moral decay ate the substance of their strength and paralyzed their energies. Over their tombstones also might have been recorded the solemn words: "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

The Phœnicians and Carthaginians

Rivalling the land powers of Western Asia, there grew up sea-powers on the Mediterranean which vied in wealth and power with the proudest of ancient peoples. The Ægeans and Greeks were noteworthy illustrations of these sea-powers; but earlier and more enterprising than either, perhaps, were the Phœnicians and their colonists, the Carthaginians.

Along the narrow strip of Phœnicia, between the mountains and the sea, flourished the cities of Sidon and Tyre. Their fishing and trading ships penetrated to every part of the Black and Mediterranean Seas and finally crept out along the European and African coasts of the impassable Atlantic. Borrowing the rudiments of their civilization from their Asiatic neighbours, they developed manufacturing, industry and commerce to a point beyond that of any other

ancient people. Their distinctive and enduring gift to posterity was that of the alphabet; but the traces of their other activities have disappeared with the prows of their ships. A cruel and materialistic religion, an autocracy of wealth, internal wars and dissensions, alliances and conflicts with their big neighbours the Assyrians and Egyptians, the Babylonians, Persians and Macedonians,—all joined to disintegrate and destroy these wealthiest seaports of the ancient world.

The Phœnician colony of Carthage, founded on the North African coast in the Western Mediterranean, repeated the excesses in religion, wealth and despotism of the mother-cities of Sidon and Tyre, and for a time dominated the western half of the Mediterranean and the islands, coastlands and cities within it. But from the beginning of its history, about 850 B. C., until its destruction at the hands of the Romans seven centuries later, Carthage was engaged in an endless series of wars upon the natives of the lands she occupied and with her inveterate rivals, the Greeks and the Romans. The island of Sicily alone was the theater of war between the Carthaginians and Greeks for 200 years; into this war the Romans entered, and they carried it on for another hundred years, until Carthage was shorn of its power, the city destroyed, and its population slaughtered or sold into slavery. So complete was the destruction of this proud warrior-city, that a grey mass of ruins and a few words in our vocabulary (like gorilla and Cadiz) are the only memorials of her existence.

The Romans

The city of Rome played such an overpowering part in ancient times, and was for so long a period the mistress of the world, that she was hailed and considered as *Roma Immortalis*, the eternal *City of God* prophesied in the Bible and in secular literature alike. But ancient Rome sowed to the flesh, and hence sowed to corruption; she knew not that sowing to the Spirit which alone brings life eternal.

Founded about twenty-seven centuries ago, she fought her way through five centuries to world-supremacy, then through five centuries more of civil wars and defense against outside powers, until she went down before bands of Teutonic barbarians, reviving again only as one of a score of rival Italian cities, and becoming the capital of the modern Kingdom of Italy only a half-century ago.

Legend portrays the first settlers of Rome as a band of cut-throats and robbers, exiled from the other towns of Italy for their crimes, and their descendants bore throughout their history the distinctive marks of their origin. Although Law is usually regarded as the greatest gift of the Romans to civilization, it was War, *War*, WAR, which was best exemplified and carried to the *nth* degree throughout their bloody history.

The doors of the Temple of Janus, which were never closed in time of war, stood open continuously at one period for nearly five hundred years, and at another for two hundred; during the entire seven centuries of the Monarchy and Republic, they were closed only twice. The list of the wars which the early Monarchy and the so-called "Republic" of Rome fought in the seven centuries of their existence included those with the Sabines; the Latins (by whom Rome had been settled, and with whom they fought wars at intervals for 400 years); the Etruscans (from whom the Romans acquired their first decided impulse toward civilization and whom it took nearly 500 years to conquer); the Æquians; the Volscians; the Auruncians; the Hernicians; the Gauls (who captured and burned the city of Rome itself, and with whom about ten wars in all were fought before their subjugation after 350 years of fighting); the Samnites (with whom were fought three desperate wars, ending in their conquest and absorption); the Greeks of Southern Italy (from whom also the Romans had received much of their civilization); the Carthaginians (with whom Rome fought three exceedingly bitter and bloody wars, in the course of which Rome was herself nearly conquered, and at

the end of which Carthage was conquered and destroyed); the Illyrians; the Spaniards; the Macedonians and other Hellenes in Greece (six wars which caused the destruction of nearly 100 towns, the slaughter or enslavement of hundreds of thousands of people, and which ended with the destruction of the famous maritime city of Corinth and the extinction of Greek self-government); the Hellenistic kingdoms of Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt (a series of wars which destroyed the last gleams of Alexander's dream: thus did Cæsar "the Great" nullify Alexander "the Great," only in turn to be nullified himself); and the Numidians of Africa (who had helped the Romans to tear the Carthaginians down).

The Goddess of History has drawn a merciful veil over the statistics and details of this bloody story of Roman wars, and the imagination alone can revivify the picture of wholesale death and destruction, the razing of cities, the enslavement of multitudes, the impoverishment of the masses, the retardation of progress, the mental retrogression and moral decay. But foreign wars were not the only ones, or even the worse in some ways, which were fought by the Romans in their ruthless career. The aristocrats fought against and overthrew the monarchs; the common people demanded civil and political liberty at the hands of the aristocrats, and fought a series of civil wars and passed a series of laws in order to secure them, only to find at the end that they were still governed by a Senatorial oligarchy and, when it was overthrown, by an absolute emperor. The Italians, conquered and annexed by Rome, turned against her again and again in an effort to secure self-government and economic freedom, only to be beaten back into subjection and into worse misery than before. The scores of thousands of slaves in Rome and her provinces, brutally ill-treated, burst into frightful insurrection on three separate occasions and were even more frightfully clubbed into death or submission.

The leaders of political factions and of successful armies,

—like Tiberius and Caius Gracchus, Marius and Cinna and Sulla, Pompey and Cæsar, Antony and Brutus, Lepidus, Crassus and Octavian,—led their respective partisans and soldiers into mutual slaughter; proscription, espionage, assassination, first by one party, then by another, filled the intervals between civil warfare. Three thousand prisoners were strangled in one day by one party; and a few months later the other party more than evened up the score. Red terror alternated with white terror; a revolutionary slaughter lasting five days was followed by a reactionary slaughter which trebled or quadrupled the number of victims; in two battles during the last year of one civil war, 80,000 soldiers were slain: such are a few of the gruesome details preserved to us.

Then, upon such a foundation as this built by the Roman "Republic," came the Roman Empire. Born amidst the civil wars of Cæsar and Pompey, Antony and Augustus, the Empire changed its leopard spots in manifold efforts to survive, but went down five hundred years later, in the West, before the Teutonic Barbarians, and fifteen hundred years later in the East before the Ottoman Turks.

The five centuries during which the Empire continued in both the East and the West included wars under every one of the seventy-three emperors, and against a long list of peoples, civilized and barbarian. Among these may be mentioned the Parthians and New Persians (with whom intermittent warfare continued during five hundred years), the Armenians, Mesopotamians, Syrians, Jews, Arabians, Ethiopians, Spaniards, Slavs, Gauls, Britons, Scots, and at least seventeen of the Germanic peoples.

Intermingled with these foreign wars, were numerous civil wars between rivals for the imperial throne, as many as thirty tyrants and six Augusti and Cæsars claiming to rule at once; the suppression of mutinies in the armies, which were composed largely of mercenary soldiers, and of revolts of the legions and the provincials in the one hundred and sixteen provinces, (in the suppression of one of these revolts

in the city of Thessalonica, for example, the Emperor Theodosius executed more than seven thousand victims); the military and occasional political supremacy of the Prætorian Guards, who set up and overturned emperors at their pleasure; the plots and conspiracies, debauchery, cruelty and wasteful extravagance in the official circles; the systematic plundering of the provinces; the inroads of pestilence and famine; the crushing of industry by unjust taxation and the concentration of land in the hands of the few; the exile of the peasants from their farms and the pauperization of the city mobs by the free distribution of bread, wine and circuses; the wide extent of human slavery; and the persecution of the Jews and the Christians.

In view of all this, it is a miracle of God's providence and man's endurance that some of the relics of the old civilization were retained and spread throughout the Mediterranean world, in the process known as "the Romanization of the Provinces." At almost the beginning of the Empire, also, in the heart and center of the transition stage between the militarism of the Republic and the militarism of the Empire, there was realized the dream of the old Hebrew prophets, the coming of the Prince of Peace. The teachings of Christianity gave a great impulse to the peace message of the Jews, and in this, and in other vital ways, the real gift of ancient Rome to the world was not the achievement of jurists or statesmen, still less of generals and conquerors, but of the obscure founders of a religion of righteousness, human helpfulness and peace.

The Eastern Roman Empire

The Eastern Roman, or the Greek, or Byzantine, Empire, as it is variously called, lasted almost a thousand years after the fall of the Roman Empire of the West. With its capital at Constantinople, it was the direct heir of the old Greek and Oriental culture; but instead of carrying this to greater heights and spreading it among still barbarous peoples, it nourished the old discredited illusions of war and

dominion and worse than wasted its chance for a thousand years of progress.

Since the lugubrious account of the decay and demoralization of the Eastern Empire which Gibbon gave in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, some historians have tried to show that the Eastern Empire achieved a noteworthy task in beating off, century after century, successive waves of barbarians who rolled in from Asia, and thus protecting Western Europe against them until such time as the civilized Western Europeans were able to protect themselves. But since many of these barbarians themselves became civilized Western Europeans, and since the strength of genuine civilization is infinitely greater than that of barbarism, the history of the Eastern Empire has been by no means rehabilitated, either by argument or by facts.

The military facts in its thousand years are innumerable and cannot even be summarized here. Suffice it to say that it engaged in almost constant wars of aggression or defense against the West Goths, the East Goths, the Vandals, the Huns, the Persians, the Arabs, the Bulgars, the Magyars, the Seljuk Turks, the Mongols, the European Crusaders, and the Ottoman Turks.

The Western Crusaders (French, German, Italian and English) were at first looked upon by the Eastern Empire as allies against the Turks; but mutual strife between the Christian forces began at almost the commencement of the Crusades and lasted almost to their end. Constantinople was attacked and captured by the Crusaders, in the last Crusading century, and for nearly sixty years the Eastern Empire in Europe was ruled over by Western usurpers, while two rival Eastern Emperors endeavoured to maintain their rule in Asia Minor.

Against their Western foes, the Eastern Emperors allied themselves with the Turks; and in the midst of their own wars with the Turks, even welcomed the Mongol hordes who broke for a time the Turkish power. But the Turkish power revived more quickly than did that of the Eastern Empire;

and in the course of four centuries of warfare and decay, the Empire gradually lost its provinces in Asia and its cities and outlying districts in Southeastern Europe. At last, in 1453, the Turks captured Constantinople and put an end to the ancient empire, which had struggled on from the days of Christ to the days of Christopher Columbus.

The wars of the Roman Empire in the East as in the West had been interspersed with similar ghastly deeds of cruelty and debauchery within the palaces; with bloody contests of political factions taking their names from the parties of the amphitheatre and the circus, the Greens and Blues, the Whites and Reds; with equally bloody and more ferocious struggles between the religious factions, the image-worshippers and the image-breakers; and with manifold oppressions of weak and vicious governments.

In the East as in the West, thanks to the same divine providence and human endurance, vestiges of the ancient civilization, especially the Greek language and literature, had been preserved within the educated circles while the storms of centuries raged without. And when Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks, some of the Greek scholars migrated to Western Europe, bringing with them the classic language and the classic learning, and thereby giving a great impulse to the Revival of Learning and the Renaissance. Perhaps the Eastern Empire thus contributed more of real and permanent value to Western civilization by its fall than by its thousand years of existence,—especially if we associate with its fall the necessity of finding an ocean-route from Europe to India, which led to the voyages of Columbus and his fellow-navigators, the discovery of America, and the colonization of the New World.

The Goths

While the Eastern Empire was engaged in fighting off barbarians in the east of Europe, some of these same barbarians were conquering and settling within the Roman Empire of the West. The Goths appear to have been the

first of the Teutonic peoples who crossed the Danube frontier of the Empire. Coming down from Southern Russia into Thrace about 250 A. D., they were driven back by the Emperor Decius beyond the Danube, but there they turned upon him, defeated his army and killed him. Decius was one of the worst persecutors of the Christians, and he and many of his successors regarded the Christians and the Goths as the worst foes of the Empire.

The Goths made good their stand in the Roman Province of Dacia and in the other lands beyond the Danube. Swarming out in their boats from the Black Sea, they harassed many parts of the Empire's Mediterranean Coast, and kept up a constant hammering at its doors on land as well. Finally, a century after the time of Decius, they were themselves attacked by bands of barbarians coming in from Asia, the dreaded Huns, and finding themselves between the hammer and the anvil they determined to find a home within the Empire.

One division of them, the West Goths, followed their leaders, Frigidern and Alaric, across the Danube, defeated and slew the Emperor Valens, marched through Greece and Italy, destroying as they went, and captured the city of Rome (410 A. D.).

Eight hundred years had passed since Rome had been in the hands of an enemy, the Gauls, and its capture by the Goths seemed to the inhabitants of the Empire an omen of the end of the world. But St. Augustine wrote a book, *The City of God*, to prove that the Eternal City prophesied in the Bible was not Rome, but the Christian Church; thus the heathen Goths and the Christians together were believed to have triumphed over the old pagan empire.

The West Goths were not seeking for homes in any city, but longed for the fertile lands which they heard of far to the South, across the Mediterranean in North Africa. Hence they shook the dust of Rome from their sandals and started southward. "Italian fever" (malaria), however, proved a more fatal foe than the Roman legions, and Alaric and

many of his soldiers died of it in Southern Italy. Burying their fallen leader in the bed of a diverted river, the West Goths retreated before the fever-stricken South, marched rapidly to the mountains of the North, rejoined their families and flocks, crossed the Alps into Southern France and the Pyrenees into Northern Spain, and set up their kingdom.

For nearly a century, the West Gothic kingdom lasted in Southern France, with its capital at Toulouse, and for two centuries longer in Northern Spain, with its capital at Toledo. The story of these three centuries is red with blood. Revolts, assassinations, foreign war; until another Teutonic people, the Franks, put an end to the West Gothic kingdom in Southern France, and the Mohammedan Moors put an end to that in Northern Spain.

The other chief branch of the Gothic people, the East Goths, had led a similar checkered and bloody career. Odovakar, a German leader of the German soldiers in the pay of the Western Roman Empire, had deposed the last Roman Emperor of the West, and ruled Italy himself. Against him came Theodoric, the leader of the East Goths, and after five years of war, Theodoric was victorious, and established his Kingdom of the East Goths in Italy.

This kingdom lasted for only about half a century, and is noteworthy chiefly because of Theodoric's attempt to persuade or compel his own people to adopt the civilization of the people in whose lands they had settled. Because of his appreciation of this civilization, barbarian though he was, he has usually been called Theodoric the Great. His attempt was only partially successful, however, for the East Goths continued to the end their stormy career of warfare. A twenty years' war with the Eastern Empire, after Theodoric's death, ended in the defeat and death of their kings and the subjection of their kingdom to a representative of the Eastern Emperor. But this arrangement lasted for only a dozen years and then the remnant of the East Goths and most of Italy came under the rule of another Teutonic people, the Lombards.

The Lombards

The Lombards had left their old home on the shores of the Baltic Sea, marched with their families and possessions through Germany and across the Alps, and under their leader Alboin conquered Italy as far south as the Tiber. Rejecting Rome as their capital, they settled chiefly in the northern valley of Italy, still called after them by the name of Lombardy.

For about two centuries their kingdom lasted, and like all others founded by the sword it wielded the sword constantly in conquest and self-defence, and finally fell beneath the sword of the Franks.

From the days of their heathen leader, Alboin, who is said to have drunk habitually from his father-in-law's skull and attempted to compel his wife to do likewise, down to the days when their last king was defeated and imprisoned for life in a monastery, the Lombards caused wholesale suffering and death and shared the same fate with their victims.

Despising cities and city-life, like the barbarians who had preceded them in Italy, they destroyed many of the populous old Roman towns, killed or drove off their inhabitants, and left them a mass of ruins, with grass growing in their streets, some of them to be overgrown by forests and to become again the haunts of wild beasts. Thus did the proud Roman, who had made many "a desert and called it peace" and built many a road throughout the world for the march of his victorious legions, invite for his descendants a bloody fate.

The Vandals

Another Teutonic people who ran a brief career of "glory" and of conquest, were the Vandals. Leaving their homes in Northern Germany, the entire people advanced by slow stages to Hungary, thence across Southern Germany and the Rhine into France, had bloody conflicts with the Franks, crossed the Pyrenees into Spain, had more bloody conflicts with the West Goths, and finally crossed the Medi-

terranean into Northern Africa, where they hoped to win the fertile lands which Alaric and the West Goths had failed to reach.

Under their leader, Genseric, they captured the populous towns of the rich and smiling coast, and established their capital in the famous old city of Carthage. Nearly six hundred years before, the Romans had conquered the Carthaginians and utterly destroyed their city. It had later been rebuilt by its Roman conquerors, who had lorded it over the Carthaginian lands during the six centuries since. And now the Romans' turn had come to bend the knee before a barbarian foe. For, not only did the Vandals establish their kingdom in the Roman province in Africa and the Mediterranean islands but, aided by warring rivals for the imperial throne, they attacked the coasts of Italy and finally captured Rome itself (455 A. D.). For fourteen days the plunder and destruction of the city continued, and so thoroughgoing and indiscriminate was it that the name of "vandalism" has been synonymous with wanton destruction ever since.

But this war-born kingdom of the Vandals was of short-lived duration. It began to decay immediately after the death of its founder, and less than eighty years after its triumph over Rome and the West, the armies of the Eastern Emperor swept down upon it and trampled it into the dust of Africa's deserts.

The Huns

While the Vandals were running their swift career of and to destruction, another barbarous people were running a career even shorter and more destructive. The Huns, a Mongolian people, came out of Central Asia in the year 375 A. D., crossed Southern Russia and the Volga River, and fell upon the East Goths, who were then living in their old home. The East Goths, defeated in battle, joined with the victors and together with them attacked their kinsmen, the West Goths. The West Goths, defeated in turn, broke

the frontier and demanded admittance within the Roman Empire; and then began that wholesale movement of the Teutonic peoples into the Roman Empire, which is known as the *Völkerwanderung*, or "the Migration of the Peoples," and which is regarded by historians as the end of the ancient and the beginning of the mediæval times.

The Huns remained in the lands which they had conquered for two generations, and then Attila, their warrior-king, led them forth for further conquest. They first raided through the Eastern Empire, far down into Syria, and then, bought off by the emperor, they turned toward the West. Across Southern Germany they rode, destroying and recruiting fighters as they went, crossed the Rhine, and fell upon the Roman province of Gaul. Here they were met by the armies of the Roman governor and the West Gothic king, and were defeated on the battle-field of Châlons-on-the-Marne. The fodder for their horses and food for their troops were destroyed by the inhabitants, and they were compelled to retreat in terror across the Rhine, whose waters drowned more than had been slain on the field of battle. The victims of this raid are placed by a contemporary historian at 300,000.

After recuperating and recruiting his army for a year, Attila led it forth again, this time across the Eastern Alps and down into Northern Italy. The fugitives of the towns and country districts through which Attila passed on his destroying march, fled to the islands and marsh-lands of the Northern Adriatic and there founded the city of Venice.

Passing on as far as Milan, on his way toward Rome, he found a picture portraying Attila at the feet of the Roman Emperor, and ordered the two figures to be reversed, with Attila on the throne and the emperor suing for peace at Attila's feet.

Not the emperor, but Pope Leo I came to Attila's camp, demanding or requesting his retirement from Italy. Whether because impressed by the personality of the pope, or bribed by gold, or deterred by the fear of the dreaded Italian fever

which had killed Alaric, forty years before, and decimated his army, or recalled to his capital by reports of revolt, or for some other reason, Attila did retire from Italy, leading most of his troops back with him.

In less than a year after his return, Attila died of apoplexy, or was strangled by a captive woman's hair, in a drunken sleep; his sons fought a mutually destructive civil war for possession of their father's throne, and the subject peoples seized the opportunity of putting an end to the military and political power of their conquerors. Like that of the Vandals, the Hunnish kingdom crumbled into pieces, and like the Vandals they left behind them only a name for the land which they had occupied, Hungary, and for the wanton destruction of which they had been guilty. Attila had proudly called himself the "Scourge of God,"—of the God of War, whose symbol was a naked sword, and who had commanded him, so Attila believed, to scourge the Christian peoples for their weaknesses and vice; the Christian clergy of the West, whose monasteries in particular had been a chief object of his attacks, accepted for him this title of the "Scourge of God," but believed that he had been sent by the true God to chastise the Christians for their sins.

The Franks

The Roman province of Gaul (now reduced to a small part of Northern France) was no sooner saved from the Huns, than it fell into the power of another barbarous people, the Teutonic Franks. These people, under their leader, Clovis, spread gradually over the Rhine-lands, defeated the last Roman governor of Gaul and several other Teutonic peoples, the Alamanni, the Burgundians, and the West Goths, who had come before them into the Roman province, and established their kingdom over nearly all of what is now called France.

The three centuries of Frankish history from the days of Clovis to the days of Charlemagne presents another bloody

story. War and the crimes and vices engendered by it ran rife through Frankish history. King after king died a violent death; their sons divided the kingdom among them, and fought one another fiercely for supremacy and reunion; plots, assassinations, abdications, dethronements, the rise of military chieftains to supremacy over the kings; wars with the Lombards, Thuringians, Bavarians, Hessians, Frisians, Saxons, Moors, Northmen, Slavs, Avars,—such is a cross-section of this aspect of their history.

For the rest, they accepted Christianity, in name at least, and Charlemagne, barbarian though he was, had a genuine regard for civilization and made spasmodic attempts to civilize his people. An alliance was made with the Pope, but chiefly to fight against the Italian foes of the Apostle of the Prince of Peace; monks and missionaries were encouraged to carry Christianity to the heathen, but the short and direct route of "conversion" by the sword was preferred as more practical against the Saxons and others. Charlemagne emulated the method of the Mohammedans in offering the alternative of death or wholesale baptism in the Saxon rivers; and yet Charlemagne's grandfather, Karl Martel, won his chief claim to fame by defeating the Mohammedan Moors when they invaded France.

The Moors were intent either on adding France to their Spanish dominion, or on putting a stop to the aid which the barbarian Franks were giving to the barbarian Goths in resisting the sway of Moorish civilization in Spain. Thus under the plea of "civilization," the Romans had conquered Gaul and fought off the barbarous Britons and Teutons; the Moors had conquered Spain and fought off the barbarous Goths and Franks; the Franks had conquered Gaul and fought off the barbarous Saxons and Danes; and that same plea was to be used for unnumbered other wars stretching through the generations down to our own day.

Frankish history came to a characteristic end with a civil war among three brothers, the grandsons of Charlemagne, and with a treaty at Verdun (843 A. D.) which divided

the Frankish realm into three parts, two of which were to grow into France and Germany, respectively, and the third was to become a bone of contention and a cause of war between France and Germany for more than a thousand years. For such widely separated disasters is the war-system responsible; a civil war between Frankish barbarians in the year 843 A. D., leading through a score of other wars over a thousand years to the World War of 1914-18! Had the peace-system been applied to this international boundary problem, as it was to the Anglo-American and various other boundaries, what untold misery might have been spared to the French, the Germans and the world! But the Franks of a thousand years ago had no more insight and foresight than the people who live upon their lands to-day.

The Northmen

Among the "outside barbarians" against whom the Franks struggled for several generations were the so-called Northmen or "Danes," including the Danes, the Norse, the Swedes, and the Anglo-Saxons. The Angles and Saxons of Northern Germany took advantage of the struggle between the other Teutons and the Romans, in the Fifth Century A. D., to invade the Roman province of Britain. With their families and flocks they migrated thither and after a century and a half of conflict they made good their settlement in the island province. Their success and the attacks of the Franks upon the Saxons remaining in Germany led to a renewed series of expeditions of the Vikings from the viks or creeks of the lands north and south of the Baltic.

These expeditions were made to the islands and coasts of the Atlantic and Mediterranean and overland across Russia to the Black Sea and Constantinople. They took the form, first of raids, then of settlement, and finally in various places of conquest. The British Isles, the coast-lands and river-towns of Germany, France, Spain, Italy and the Near

East were visited by bands of the Northern raiders, who carried death and destruction everywhere with them. In Normandy, they were allowed to settle and rule, and there they so speedily adopted Christianity and civilization that when their descendants of only a century and a half later conquered England they gave a great impulse to its civilization. In England they raided, settled and finally ruled, and there too they left a permanent impress both of weal and woe. In Sicily and Southern Italy they grappled with the invading Saracens, overcame them, set up their kingdom in the conquered lands, and then accepted the civilization of the Saracens, which they found superior to their own.

Throughout Western Europe and most of the Mediterranean world, these Northmen raiders carried war and desolation and then were either civilized by those whom they conquered, or were recruited for the armies of civilized states and thus added their ideals and methods of warfare to those which civilization had developed.

One group of them settled first in Iceland, then in Greenland, and thence sent expeditions to the coast of North America. If they had turned their energies into the colonization of the New World, instead of wasting them upon war in the Old, they might have anticipated the Spaniards, English and French in beginning that great and beneficent task by half a thousand years.

The Arabs

A century before the Northmen began their raids, there came from the desert and coast-towns of Arabia another remarkable band of barbarian warriors. Unified for the first time, politically and religiously, by the genius of Mohammed, and their warlike ardour inflamed by the fiery religion of conquest which he preached, they followed their successive leaders upon an almost unparalleled career of conquest.

Arabia, Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, Persia, Egypt, North Africa to the Atlantic, most of Spain, and the islands of the Mediterranean, all yielded to Arab rule and the Moham-

medan religion. Religious quarrels and civil war among the Christians of these lands, the decay of the Eastern Empire and the fall of the Western, had paved the way for the Arabs' successes. While revolts, divisions, incessant civil war between two rival factions for the caliphate, the corruption of militarism, and the vices of civilization which they acquired along with its virtues, paved the way for the conquest of the Arabs by the Turks.

The Arabs too, like so many other peoples, were given their chance to promote the welfare of humanity. Their period of power was not wholly one of ruin and destruction. With Semitic genius, they absorbed many of the elements of civilization which they found centered in such great cities as Jerusalem, Damascus, and Alexandria, and carried them with them to their new homes, preserving them and handing them on to the more barbarous Europeans of the West. But the ways of war were more pleasant and seemed more "practical" to them than the paths of peace. They took the sword and perished by the sword. For nearly nine hundred years they have lived under the rule of the Turks. To-day, since the World War freed them, at least temporarily, from the Turks, they face the impending fate of subjection to the British. They have their national aspirations for independence and self-government, and hope to unite Arabs in all the Western Asiatic lands into a far-reaching "Pan-Arabia"; but, the shadow of the sword (their own and other peoples') which hangs so dark over their past is ominous of evil for their future.

The Seljuk Turks and the Crusaders

The Turks, who have always been considered utter barbarians by their European opponents, have naturally emulated their more civilized neighbours in deeds of war.

Coming down from Central Asia, some tribes of Turks formed a union known as the Seljuk and conquered most of Southwestern Asia. In Mesopotamia, they found the Arabic Caliphate of Bagdad, and although they accepted

the Mohammedan religion from their Arabic subjects, they deprived the caliph of all secular power and permitted him to remain only the spiritual head of Islam.

The Seljuk Turks retained their power for only about half a century (1058-1092) and then they separated into a number of small sultanates, which gave the Eastern Empire and the Western Crusaders a chance to attack them with success.¹

The Eastern Emperor was eager to regain the lands in Western Asia which the Arabs and Seljuk Turks had taken from him, and he appealed to Western Europe to come to his aid against the Mohammedans and to rescue the Holy Land from their power. Western Europe responded to this religious appeal, and for nearly two centuries (1096-1270) poured expedition after expedition into the Near East, striving to regain Jerusalem and to establish kingdoms in the lands which they took from the Turks, but which they refused to restore to the Empire. We have seen how, in one of the Crusades, even Constantinople was captured by the Western Europeans and the so-called "Latin Kingdom of Constantinople" took the place for a half-century of the Eastern Empire itself.

In the first of the Crusades, Jerusalem was captured and the Crusaders founded the feeble, and extremely feudal Kingdom of Jerusalem, which lasted for about ninety years, when it was reconquered by the Mohammedans. In only one other of the seven Crusades was Jerusalem taken by the Christians, and then it was regained chiefly by diplomacy, instead of by war, and was held for only a few years.

The two centuries of the Crusades were fruitless as far as their chief object was concerned, for Jerusalem and Palestine have remained until our own time in Mohammedan, instead of in Jewish or Christian, hands. They had numerous other indirect results, some good and some evil; but from the point of view of war as a method of achievement, they were far worse than a failure. For pestilence, famine

¹ See pages 149-152.

and manifold hardships, added to wholesale slaughter, caused the fruitless death of many hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children.

For example, in the First Crusade, an uncounted multitude of civilians forming the van of the expedition were annihilated in Hungary and Bulgaria on the march overland; while of about 250,000 regular soldiers who started for Jerusalem, less than one-tenth the number arrived before its walls. When the survivors succeeded in capturing the city, they engaged in a wholesale massacre of the inhabitants and rode through streets flowing with human blood on their way to the sepulchre of the Prince of Peace.

In the so-called Children's Crusade, which is not counted among the regular seven expeditions, many thousands of boys and girls perished on the march or were sold into slavery. And of the many smaller expeditions which started for Jerusalem almost unnoticed and unrecorded during the two centuries, only the bleached bones of human victims were left along the road as mute memorials of human folly.

The persecution and massacre of the Jews and Christian heretics in Western Europe form another black spot on the history of the Crusades. So fierce was this persecution of the Jews that most of the race sought refuge in Eastern Europe among the more humane barbarians of Russia. The crusading zeal of the Church was turned with such ferocity against the heretics of France, Italy and elsewhere that a special tribunal, the Inquisition, was formed to hunt them down and a bloody series of executions, massacres and wars nearly exterminated them and, with them, the prosperity and progress of many a fair and thriving valley. And yet to-day,—such is the irony of history,—a nation of Protestant heretics, the British, is endeavouring to place the Holy Land in the hands of the Jews!

The Ottoman Turks

The weakening of the Seljuk Turks by the combined attacks of the Crusaders, the Arabs and the Eastern Empire,

gave opportunity for the rise in Western Asia of another Turkish people. These were the nomadic followers of a military leader, Osman or Othman, who united their scattered and warring bands, gave them his name, and led them into Asia Minor to conquer and to rule. During the Fourteenth Century they subdued Western Asia and crossed into Europe.

The terrible Mongol invasion of Timour Lenk or Tamerlane threatened their power and existence; but they weathered the storm and in the middle of the Fifteenth Century (1453) captured Constantinople and put an end to the Eastern Roman Empire. From this time, they were regarded as the great power of the Near East, alternately the terror, the allies, and the victims of the great powers of Western Europe.

Having conquered the lands of the Eastern Empire in Asia and its European capital, the Turks set out to conquer all the lands to which it had laid claim in Europe. Greece, the Balkan lands, and Hungary were successively subjected to their sway, Austria was attacked by land, and a Turkish navy was built to conquer the islands in the Eastern Mediterranean and to cope with the fleets of the commercial cities of Italy, especially Venice and Genoa.

While this Turkish advance was being made the Austrians, Germans and Spaniards were fighting civil wars with the Protestants and peasants at home, and a series of a half-dozen wars with the French and Italians. At times, the Turks were called in by the Christian rulers as allies of a royal or imperial claimant against his rival; at another, the "most Christian" King of France became the ally of the Mohammedan Sultan against the "most Catholic" King of Spain and the Holy Roman Empire; and at still another, the Pope, the Holy Roman Emperor, the most Christian King, the most Catholic King, and the Sultan were all fighting against Venice, which was supposed to be protecting Western Europe by sea against "the terrible Turk."

The Turkish Sultan duly impressed by the fighting capa-

bilities of the Christians, enrolled thousands of them into privileged bands, called the Janizaries, and they became the flower of his army. But, like the Prætorian Guard of the early Roman Empire, the Janizaries struggled to secure supreme power within the state, and after two centuries of turbulent militarism, which was the chief cause of the decline of the Turkish Empire, the Sultan ordered a massacre of their officers and their expulsion from his armies.

The wars between Austria and the French, and between the Catholics and the Protestants, went on side by side with the wars between Austria and the Turks. Vienna, the Austrian capital, was besieged repeatedly by Turkish armies, and on at least one of these occasions it would probably have been captured, had it not been for the aid supplied by Germany and Poland. A century later, Austria conspired with Russia and Germany to divide Poland up among them; while Venice, which had stood out against the Turks on the Mediterranean was conquered by France and handed over to Austria!

During the twenty years' war between Sweden and Russia (1700-1721), Turkey was induced to become the ally of Sweden, and thrice more in the Eighteenth Century, Russia and Austria fought Turkey, the second time at intervals during twenty-five years, and celebrated their triumph over the Mohammedan barbarians by joining with Prussia to conquer and divide Christian Poland,—who in former years had done so much to help them against the Turks!

When Napoleon Bonaparte loomed up at the end of the century, conquered Egypt from the Turks and invaded Syria, Turkey made an alliance with Russia and Great Britain and the French were finally expelled by this triple alliance from the Near East. During Napoleon's attempt, however, his own army of 36,000 men was sadly diminished, and many thousands of Turks perished in siege and battle, 1,200 prisoners being massacred in cold blood after their surrender at Jaffa, and 5,000 people being killed in the suppression of a revolt in Cairo. A few years later, Russia

again turned upon Turkey and continued the war against her for several years until Napoleon and the French invaded Russia.

These ups and downs and about-faces, this kaleidoscope, of European diplomacy in connection with Turkey is the keynote of the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Century, as well as of the Eighteenth. For the great powers of the West were well launched upon their career of imperialistic rivalry by 1800, and they have made it the guiding star of their policy down to the present hour. The Balkan States, beginning with Greece in 1821 and coming on down to Albania in 1919, have one after the other taken advantage of this rivalry to secure their independence of Turkey; and the great powers have one after the other taken advantage of these rebellions in Turkey to assert their control over Turkey and to get ahead of one another in their imperialistic aggressions.

England, France, and Russia fought Turkey in behalf of Greek independence; England and France fought Russia in support of Turkey against the rebellions of the Christians in Serbia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, and Roumania; Russia fought Turkey again in support of these renewed rebellions; England and Austria again threatened to fight Russia in behalf of Turkey, but consented to keep the peace on Russia's retirement from Turkey and Turkey's cession of Cyprus to England, and of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria; Greece fought Turkey for the acquisition of Macedonia, Thrace and Albania, but was defeated; after Italy had fought Turkey and forced the cession of Tripoli and the *Ægean* Isles to Italy, Greece joined with Serbia and Bulgaria and defeated Turkey, but the victors quarrelled over the spoils, and Greece, Serbia and Roumania fought Bulgaria, while England, France and Germany refused to permit the Turks to be expelled from Europe; in the World War, Turkey fought on the side of Germany, Austria and Bulgaria, hoping if victorious to regain much of what she had lost; after the World War, the Turks were expelled from Europe, and

the Greeks attempted to conquer Turkish lands in Asia Minor, but were driven out and the Turks came back into Constantinople and Eastern Thrace, while England, France, Italy and Russia quarrelled over the fate of Turkey and their respective shares of Turkey's lands in Europe and Asia.

Such is a glimpse of the sordid story of the dealings of the imperialistic powers of Western Europe with Turkey and with one another over Turkey's head. Meanwhile, rebellion in lands under Turkish rule caused the mutual massacre of millions of Christians and Mohammedans; and almost perpetual warfare carried with it the destruction of human life by war, pestilence and famine, and the checking of progress by an excessive militarism throughout Turkey and all the Balkan lands. The Turkish Problem, or the Problem of the Near East, still remains unsolved, although the war-method of force and threats has been steadily applied to it for centuries. The folly and ferocity of the war-method have never been more convincingly exemplified in history than by the story of the mutual relations between Turkey and Europe. It is high time that the peace-method should be consistently applied to all the problems like that of the Near East which are a menace to world peace and a disgrace to humanity.

The Bulgars

The Bulgars, like the Turks, were originally an Asiatic people who migrated westward and attacked the Eastern Roman Empire. Century after century, attack, repulse, defeat and victory continued in the relations between the two peoples. At one time an extensive Bulgarian Empire was established in the Balkan Peninsula with a foothold on the Black and Ægean Seas, and reaching out toward the Adriatic; but the Empire called the Russian Slavs to its aid, and together they overcame the Bulgarians and gave them Christianity and Slavic language and customs. Indeed, it is believed that the Bulgars were so greatly reduced in numbers by their centuries of warfare that even physically,

as well as linguistically and culturally, they were overwhelmed and absorbed by the Slavs.

When the Turks came into Europe, about 1350, the Bulgars joined with the Eastern Empire and other Balkan peoples in trying to expel them; but within a generation, the Turks were victorious and the Bulgars came under Turkish rule. Under this rule they remained for nearly five centuries, when by the aid and instigation of the Russians, they joined with Serbia and Montenegro in revolt against the Turkish government. The revolt was stamped out in blood and flames, with ferocious deeds committed on both sides. Then the Russians fought and defeated the Turks, and Bulgaria was made a separate principality within the Turkish Empire, under the military protection of Russia. England, fearful of the Russian advance in Asia, made a defensive alliance with Turkey, a conference of the great powers was held and the new Principality of Bulgaria was greatly reduced in size.

A few years later, Turkey and Bulgaria agreed to set aside the arrangement made by the great powers and the two parts of Bulgaria were reunited within the Principality; but this growth of power on Bulgaria's part caused a war with Serbia, an envious or fearful neighbour. The great powers intervened to stop this war; but their own rivalry for the domination of Turkey's lands in Europe continued, and when Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina in defiance of the other great powers, Bulgaria declared its complete independence of Turkey, made its prince a king, and added its gold to the great powers' threat to keep Turkey quiet.

Then came the two Balkan Wars of 1912-13, in which Bulgaria first fought with Serbia and Greece against Turkey, and then had to defend her annexations against Serbia, Greece and Roumania. Defeated in this second war and chafing under the losses forced upon her by her former allies, Bulgaria joined with Turkey, Austria and Germany in the World War of 1914-18.

Defeated in the last war, the peasants of Bulgaria evi-

dently made up their minds that the war-method, which had dragged their country through centuries of misery, was a crime, and they proceeded to a drastic prosecution of these latest criminals, their militaristic rulers, who had inflicted it upon them. This struggle is still going on, as these words are written, and its progress and result may teach a very useful lesson as to one good way of getting rid of the war-method and of substituting the peace-method. War is a game at which, if the people were wise, princes would not play!

The Serbs

The Serbs did not belong originally to the same race as the Bulgars, but they were a part of the great Slavic people who Slavicized the Bulgars. Like the Bulgars, they came into contact with the civilization of the Eastern Empire and accepted Christianity and other elements of that civilization. Like the Bulgars, also, when the Turks invaded Europe, the Serbs fought against them, were defeated, and for five centuries were under Turkish rule. Some of the Serbian fugitives, escaping to the mountain fastnesses of Montenegro, maintained practical independence.

When the power of Turkey declined and its existence began to be menaced by Russia, in the second half of the Nineteenth Century, Serbia and Montenegro joined with Bulgaria in revolt, and by the aid of Russia secured their independence. The great powers of Western Europe, when they intervened, recognized this independence, but reduced the territory of the two new kingdoms, fearing lest they should be dominated by Russia and add unduly to Russia's strength in the game of imperialism which all the great powers were playing against one another.

Serbia never forgave the great powers for this restriction of its territory and continued to cherish the ambition to reach out for footholds on the Ægean and the Adriatic. When Austria annexed the Turkish province of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908, and thus cut Serbia off from the sea

and also prevented her union with other Serbian people, the Serbians went to the verge of war with their big neighbour. War was prevented at that time, but Austrians continued to believe that Serbia was striving to break up the Austrian Empire in pursuance of her territorial ambition. This belief became greatly strengthened in consequence of Serbia's annexations after the first and second Balkan Wars against Turkey and Bulgaria. Hence, when the heir to the Austrian throne was murdered by a Serb in a Bosnian city, on that fateful June day, 1914, Austria sent to Serbia the ultimatum which led to the World War. This time, as always, war bred more and bigger wars, the wind grew into the whirlwind.

German, Austrian and Bulgarian troops invaded Serbia and Montenegro during the World War, drove their armies out and conquered their lands. At the end of the war, Serbia's independence was restored and her territory was enlarged by the annexation of Montenegro, and of Croatia and Slovenia which had formed part of the Austrian Empire. Serbia's determination to reach the Adriatic has caused grave trouble with Italy and Albania in recent months, and her relations with Greece and Bulgaria are far from friendly.

Whether the virus of militarism has entered so deeply into the Serbians' nature, during the long course of their bloody history, that they will insist on the use of the war-method instead of the peace-method for solving their domestic disputes with the Montenegrins, Croats and Slovenes, and their foreign disputes with their neighbours, remains to be seen. These Balkan lands are still one of the centers of the world's greatest unrest, and there is no place on earth where the discard of the war-method and the application of the peace-method is more sorely needed.

Roumania

The Roumanians proudly point to their name, language and early history as proof of the fact that their land was

settled by the Romans of the Empire and that they themselves are of Roman descent. But with this slight Italian element, there are large Gothic, Turkish and Slavic elements in their population. The Slavs in particular swept in successive waves across the Roumanian plains, and the civilization that came to them was from the Eastern, rather than from the Western, Roman Empire.

When the Turks invaded Southeastern Europe in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, Roumania resisted, but was conquered along with the other lands. It shared their fate for centuries under Turkish rule, but Russia intervened earlier in its behalf and about a century ago compelled the Turks to grant it complete self-government. The Russians continued their championship of Roumanian independence from Turkey; but England and France feared Russian, even more than Turkish, influence in Roumania, and fought on the side of Turkey against Russians and Roumanians in the Crimean War. Russia, defeated in this war, saw her influence in Roumania supplanted by that of France, and decided to solve the problem by another resort to war. In this war, Russia was victorious; but again the great powers of the West stepped in, preserved Turkey as a bulwark against Russia, and freed Roumania from both Russian and Turkish domination.

In the first Balkan War of 1912-13, Roumania did not take part; but, jealous of the annexations of the Turkish lands by Bulgaria, she joined with Serbia and Greece in the second Balkan War against Bulgaria, and compelled Bulgaria to surrender to her a district on the Black Sea called the Dobrudja, although it was inhabited by a quarter-million Bulgarians.

When the World War began, Roumania was long undecided as to joining the Central Powers, in order to acquire from Russia another district on the Black Sea, called Bessarabia, or the Allies, in order to acquire Transylvania from Hungary. She finally decided that the Allies would win, so joined them and invaded Hungary; the German and

Austrian troops speedily conquered Roumania, but at the end of the war, the Allies gave Transylvania to Roumania, to punish Hungary, and also Bessarabia, to check Bolshevik Russia.

With this heritage of enmities and acquisition of lands from her neighbours, the future of Roumania looks ominous, especially if she continues to persecute her Jewish citizens, who still number nearly a million in spite of a half-century of bitter persecution. Having territorial or other quarrels with every one of her six neighbours, it behoves Roumania especially to discard the war-method in the future and at least give a fair trial to some other method not so overweighted with inconsistency, suffering, death, brutality and injustice.

Poland

One of Roumania's neighbours is Poland, and its history, too, is filled with warfare and war's attendant evils. The Poles were Slavs, who came into Eastern Europe from Asia, fought with and absorbed the old inhabitants, and in the course of two centuries gradually formed the separate kingdoms of Poland, Bohemia and Russia.

Wars with the Germans, Austrians, Hungarians, Mongols, Lithuanians, Turks, and Russians, and innumerable civil wars and factional fights, make up the military story of Poland. It annexed Lithuania and various other lands, and for several centuries was one of the two or three largest powers in Europe. It received its civilization and religion from Central Europe, and came to the aid of Central Europe during the centuries when the Turks were hammering at its gates.

But the worst enemies of Europe proved to be those of its own household, and Germans, Austrians, Poles and Russians fought one another with more destructive results than Turks or Mongols were able to inflict. Finally, Poland went down before her three big neighbours, Russia, Austria, and Germany, and was divided up among them. This crime

against an entire nation was consummated at the very time when the criminals were engaged in a quarter-century war with France for "the defense of humanity against revolution and socialistic anarchy."

During the century of their subjection, the Poles never gave up their hope of freedom, and engaged in several insurrections which were ruthlessly suppressed. In the World War, Poland was fought across by the armies on both sides, and her peasantry suffered frightful hardship and loss of life. After the war, the Poles demanded their restoration to national existence and the reunion of the severed parts of their country. Reunion and independence have been restored to them, and if the peace-method can be applied to their external and internal difficulties, they may again become one of Europe's largest and most progressive nations. These difficulties are very serious, however, and have already, in the few years of Poland's restored independence, involved her in wars with Lithuania and Russia, and made Germany and Czecho-Slovakia her bitter enemies. If she revives her old ambition to establish an unbroken realm reaching from the Baltic to the Black Sea, trespassing on Germany in the West and Russia in the East, following the lead and depending on the military aid of France against her two big neighbours, she will again stir up a hornets' nest against her, and external war will aid her factional fights at home, her persecution of the Jews and her struggle with pestilence and poverty, to waste away her powers and pull her down once more.

Bohemia (Czecho-Slovakia)

The back-bone of the new Republic of Czecho-Slovakia is the ancient Bohemia, which emerged as a separate kingdom from the chaos of Slavic invasion and settlement in the Seventh Century A. D. For six centuries before this, Bohemia had been the theater of war, first between the Celts and Germans, and then among the Germans themselves.

The details of the warfare of the Slavs are lacking; but after they possessed themselves of the land, they began two centuries of war with the Germans, attempting to push them westward, as the Germans had pushed the Celts. The Germans retaliated with vigour and at last compelled the Bohemians to recognize their political dependence upon the German, or Holy Roman, Emperor. From that time, various German noblemen fought to become dukes or kings of Bohemia, and one of them became himself the Emperor and left the imperial title to his descendants for a hundred years.

Meanwhile, the Bohemians were having wars with the Mongols, and with Austria and Hungary, which ended in their subjection, first to Hungary and then to Austria. During all these centuries, also, Bohemia suffered from feudal tyranny and the civil wars of feudal rivals; and when the religious reformer, John Hus, was burned at the stake and an attempt was made to crush his followers, the terrible Hussite Wars began in Bohemia and lasted for nearly twenty years (1419-1436). Two centuries later, the Bohemians were involved in another religious war between the Catholics and Protestants (the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648), and again suffered terrible loss of life and devastating hardships.

Again, in the wars of the Eighteenth Century between Austria and Prussia, in those of the Napoleonic era between France and Austria; again in the Nineteenth Century, in the war between Prussia and Austria; and yet again in the Twentieth Century, in the World War, Bohemia has been the victim of invasion, battles in the field, autocracy, anarchy, and the manifold ills which follow in the train of Mars.

Moravia and Slovakia, which have united with Bohemia to make up the new republic of Czecho-Slovakia, have shared most of the storms of Bohemia's history, and now, although the Slovaks are not entirely satisfied with their share in the union, all the world hopes for the youthful

state a future marred by no more of the scars of war, civil or foreign, but brightened by the sunshine of peace and progress.

Russia

Russia, the largest of the Slavic states, was one of the latest to get started. The bands of Slavs who occupied its vast expanses were welded into a loose political union by the House of Rurik, which ruled over the many princes for about seven hundred years (900 to 1600 A. D.). During this period, the Russians fought with the Swedes, who set up an independent republic in Russia, with Novgorod as its center, which lasted for six centuries; and with the Mongols, who ruled over a large part of Russia for two centuries and a half.

The end of the House of Rurik was followed by a fierce war of succession, which lasted for ten years, and resulted in the supremacy of the House of Romanoff. This war-born dynasty lasted for three hundred years, until the World War swept it from the throne. The Romanoffs made spasmodic efforts during their three centuries of rule to compel their subjects to adopt the civilization of Western Europe, but their efforts were largely nullified by the twin evils of militarism and autocracy which they promoted and defended as the bulwarks of their throne.

The wars which they fought included one with Poland, and the reconquest of Little, or White, Russia; three with Sweden, (one of which lasted for twenty years) with the object of making the Baltic Sea a Russian and not a Swedish lake, and with the result of conquering the Baltic provinces of Livonia, Esthonia, Courland and Finland; one lasting seven years in alliance with Sweden, France and Austria against Prussia, with the object of dividing Prussia up among Russia, Austria and France,—although Prussia had aided Russia in its terrible war with Sweden; two naval wars in alliance with Sweden and Denmark against England; five wars against France, in alliance with England,

Austria, Prussia, Sweden, and even Turkey; and at last eight wars against Turkey, at one time in alliance with England and France, at another time having England and France allied with Turkey against her.

Russia's excuse for attacking Turkey so many times was the protection of Turkey's Christian Slavic subjects; but the chief object of the wars was the capture of Constantinople and the Dardanelles as an outlet for Russia from the Black Sea. Their chief result was the acquisition from Turkey of Azoff, Bessarabia, and the Crimea; while Russia's success made Austria and Prussia jealous and anxious, and led to the dividing up of Poland among the three powers.

The wars with France led to Napoleon and the Czar dividing Europe between them, and finally to Napoleon's invasion of Russia and the burning of Moscow,—an expedition which caused the death of 300,000 young men in Napoleon's army, and an unknown number of Russian and other victims. The division of Poland was accomplished, and the wars against France continued, under the plea of suppressing "revolutionary violence," or Jacobinism, and of preventing the restoration of Poland. And yet the French Republic of to-day has been supporting expeditions against and rebellions within Russia, on the plea of suppressing "revolutionary violence," or Bolshevism. How difficult it is for men and nations to learn the plain teachings of history!

Under the plea of suppressing "revolutionary violence," also, the Russian Czar formed an alliance between Russia, Austria and Prussia which was called the Holy Alliance. For a generation after the fall of Napoleon, this alliance intervened in the domestic affairs of various European countries, and by threatening to crush South American independence and to restore the dominion of Spain in the New World called forth from the United States an assertion of the Monroe Doctrine.

By use of espionage, tyranny and armed force, the Holy

Alliance crushed every effort in Europe toward the establishment of constitutional representative government and freedom of various kinds; until it succeeded in stirring up the bitter and bloody Revolution of 1848, which swept away many of the old champions of military autocracy. Russian armies went into Hungary and aided the Austrians to crush the Hungarian attempt to secure liberty; while in Russia itself, a secret society of Nihilists arose to meet violence by violence and to secure freedom by means of assassination.

Partly to check their difficulties at home by distracting their people's attention to foreign affairs, and partly to add to the Russian Empire in Europe and Asia, the czars entered upon a far-reaching programme of conquest and annexation which carried the Russian flag through Central Asia to the confines of British India and across Siberia to the Pacific. This expansion brought the Russians into conflict, not only with the Circassians, Georgians, Armenians, Tatars, Turcomans, Mongols, Siberians, Afghans, Bokharans, Khivans, Chinese, Manchus, and other peoples whose lands they occupied, but also with the great powers which were rivalling Russia in the field of imperialistic enterprise.

A frightfully bloody war was fought in 1905-06 between Russia and Japan, because Japan had become alarmed by Russia's advance into Manchuria and by the danger that China might become a Russian dependency. Another war between Russia and Great Britain in 1907 was narrowly averted when Russia in her advance toward British India threatened to absorb Persia. The rise at this time of the sea-power of Germany, and Germany's growing influence in Turkey, induced Great Britain and Russia to refrain from fighting each other over the possession of Persia, but to divide Persia practically between them!

This latter method of settling a dispute between great powers, although defended as a phase of the peace-method, was, of course, an iniquitous one; but a proper use of the real peace-method was resorted to with success in bringing

about the Peace of Portsmouth, which put an end to the war between Russia and Japan by the extension of the good offices and mediation of the United States. During the Russo-Japanese War, also, the peace-method was successfully resorted to, this time in the form of an international commission of inquiry into the Dogger Bank dispute, which prevented Great Britain from being drawn into the war against Russia, although she was at the time in alliance with Japan.

After the British and Russian agreement in regard to Persia, in 1907, settled for a time their rivalry in Central Asia, their mutual fear of Germany's expansion controlled their foreign policies until, in 1914, the World War began and England, France and Russia, tied together by the "Triple Entente," led the Allies in their resistance to Germany and Austria. The participation of Russia, the world's most militaristic and autocratic government, on the side of the Allies in the World War, was, of course, very embarrassing to the Allies who claimed that they were fighting to make the world safe for peace and democracy. But about the middle of the war, the Russian people seized the opportunity of completing their revolution, which they had begun at the end of the war with Japan, and which resulted in the overthrow of the czar and his government and the establishment of a Soviet Republic.

Russia had suffered immense losses of men and wealth in the war with Japan, but her losses in the World War made the former ones seem insignificant. Army after army was hurled against Germany and Austria, only to be beaten back with terrible loss of life; for example, in the single battle of Tannenberg, nearly 100,000 Russians were *captured* alone, and uncounted thousands were slain; in the Galician campaigns, the Russians lost nearly a million in killed and wounded; while in the war as a whole, the Russian losses were: $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions known to have been killed; 5 millions wounded or gassed; $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions captured or "missing."

In the years following the war, pestilence and famine

have claimed millions of other victims in Russia,—perhaps as many as 10 millions; so that the last war has probably taken a toll in Russian lives, directly and indirectly, amounting to 25 or 30 millions! If there is any nation on earth which should insist that the war-method be discarded and the peace-method be adopted, it is surely the people of mighty Russia. They have shown this determination by proposing to the League of Nations complete and universal disarmament, and by fulfilling their promise under the Kellogg Pact in refraining from a war with China over the Eastern Manchurian Railroad dispute.

Sweden

Russia's next-door neighbour, Sweden, got started sooner on its military career, but its authentic history does not begin until about 800 A. D. In the prehistoric centuries there is evidence of much warfare in Sweden especially between the Goths and the Finns, between the Swedes and the Slavs, and the Swedes and the Norse. For some centuries after the beginning of the historic period, the Swedes took part with the other Northmen in their raids, settlements and conquests in various parts of Europe. For two hundred years, in the Eleventh and Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, with but slight interruptions, a civil war raged in Sweden itself, in the course of which the common people suffered bitterly, the free peasants were swept away, and a military nobility arose to rule and ruin; while the rival kings imprisoned, killed, or starved one another, or were deposed and exiled by the nobles.

When the Thirty Years' War between the Catholics and Protestants of Germany was running its destructive course, the Swedes under their king Gustav-Adolf fought against Poland and Russia, and intervened in behalf of the Protestants, with the ultimate object of acquiring or controlling Prussia and Pomerania so that the Baltic Sea might be made a Swedish lake. For two years, Gustav's army suffered various repulses and gained two "brilliant" but

bloody victories, in the last of which Gustav lost his own life; and then for sixteen years longer, his military successors continued the war.

The successes of the Swedish armies in Germany aroused the envy and anxiety of Denmark and led to a war between the two Protestant countries, each of them in its turn a champion of Protestantism in Germany. Sweden conquered Holstein and Schleswig from Denmark, but restored them when peace was made, contenting itself with some Danish islands and with Pomerania, which it received from Germany. At this time Sweden began the colonization of lands in America, on the Delaware River, which it proudly called "New Sweden," and which might have led to beneficent results for both America and Sweden. But this attempt at colonization was marred by quarrels with the Dutch in America, weakened by the wars of aggression which the government carried on in Europe, and was finally ended by the Dutch conquest and annexation of New Sweden.

Regarded as the first power of the North after the Thirty Years' War, Sweden pursued her policy of expansion, which brought her into a six years' war with Poland, Russia, Denmark and Germany. This war having brought but small gains to Sweden, its next move, ten years later, was to ally itself with the French "conqueror," Louis XIV, and to fight as his ally against Holland, Prussia, Brandenburg and Spain. This war also having been a practical failure, the Swedes followed their king, Charles XII, into a war of twenty years against Russia, Denmark, Prussia, Hanover, Saxony and Poland. Sieges, battles, marches, and counter-marches from the Baltic to the Black Sea, all of which entailed great loss of life and property, marked this as most other wars, and ended as most other wars have done in strengthening the strong and weakening the weak: Russia gained the Baltic Provinces of Sweden and Prussia gained Pomerania.

The Swedes were so disgusted with the wars of their kings that they permitted their nobility to seize the royal power and to veto any more wars of aggression. But the aristoc-

racy was no better than the monarchy, and during the rest of the Eighteenth Century, Sweden was engaged in war again with Russia on two occasions, with Prussia, England and France. It had fought for France under the despot, Louis XIV, but now fought against France under the despot Napoleon.

But in spite of their common hatred of "revolution" and Napoleon, the King of Sweden and the Czar of Russia were so intent on their game of empire that during the Napoleonic Wars, they fought each other for the possession of Finland. The Russians conquered Finland and when they invaded Sweden the people rose against their king and expelled him and his family from the kingdom.

Russia retained Finland; but, to secure Sweden's further aid against Napoleon, Russia promised to take Norway from Denmark and give it to Sweden, and England promised to make no objection to this transfer! While Napoleon was toppling, Sweden made sure of Norway by invading and conquering Denmark, and after Napoleon's fall the Allies confirmed Sweden's possession of Norway. The Norse objected, however, to being handed over from one government to another, and Sweden found it necessary to fight another war against the Norwegians to compel their submission.

In spite of this victory, Sweden was exhausted by her long series of wars and was overshadowed by her big neighbours, the Russians and Prussians, who had grown great largely by her mistakes, so that during the rest of the Nineteenth Century Sweden was a third or fourth-rate power. Her people had learned the bitter lesson that war does not pay; hence, when Norway insisted upon independence, in 1905, Sweden yielded to the "bloodless revolution" which made Norway an independent state.

When the World War loomed up, in 1914, her people were again determined not to resort to the bloody trial of battle and were able to maintain throughout four most difficult years their country's neutrality as between Russia and Germany, both of which countries they had all too

much reason to fear. After the World War, when Finland secured its independence from Russia and claimed the Aland Islands from Sweden, the Swedes again resorted to the peace-method as against the war-method and agreed, first, to submit the Aland Islands question to arbitration, and then to abide peacefully by the award which went against them in favour of Finland.

Having thus entered definitely on the pathway of peace, the Swedes give fine promise of enjoying far more prosperity and happiness than in their old, wicked days of warfare and aggression, and they will doubtless render great aid to the world at large in its efforts to follow the same pathway of peace.

Norway

Norway was one of the chief headquarters of the Northmen, or Vikings, who terrorized civilized Europe in the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Centuries. What grim warfare went on in Norway itself before these raids and conquests, history has made no record.

During their attacks upon the rest of Europe, the Norse chieftains were set upon at home by those of their number who aspired to be kings, and the civil wars and anarchy were intense and terrible. After one of these, a band of freebooters followed their leader, Rollo, into France and won a province, called after them "Normandy." Here they rapidly absorbed civilization and when Rollo's descendant, William, achieved the conquest of England a century and a half later, he gave a great impulse to civilization in England. From Norway, also, went those restless Vikings who conquered and settled, first Iceland, then Greenland, and finally found their way to the coasts of North America, five hundred years before Columbus came. But these settlements (except Iceland) were allowed to languish and disappear; for the Norse were too busy prosecuting their wars in Europe to devote themselves successfully to peaceful colonization.

Denmark, England, Scotland, Ireland and others of the British Isles felt the tread of their marching and conquering feet. The Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries filled Norway with civil and foreign wars, especially with Denmark and Sweden. The clergy, the nobles and the king engaged in a three-sided struggle; and in one of them the king was deposed and first Norway and Denmark, and then Norway, Denmark and Sweden were brought together under a single government (1397-1524).

This union was an interesting and successful way of applying the peace-method, and it lasted for a century and a quarter. Then Sweden broke away under its own kings, who began a series of wars against Russia, Poland and other countries. Norway and Denmark remained united; but in the following century, their king caught the contagion of warfare, joined in the Thirty Years' War against the Catholics of Germany, was severely defeated, and for a time lost most of Denmark. Sweden took up the leadership of the Protestants in the Thirty Years' War and was for a time so successful that the king of Norway and Denmark became envious and anxious and, while Protestant Sweden was fighting Catholic Germany, Protestant Norway and Denmark fought Protestant Sweden and received military aid from their Catholic German allies! This war against Protestants was as unsuccessful as the war against Catholics had been, and Norway and Denmark lost considerable territory to Sweden when peace was made at the end of thirty years of carnage and destruction.

Another war soon occurred between the two Scandinavian neighbours, and it too resulted in defeat and loss of territory for Norway and Denmark.

When Sweden fought Russia in the Northern War (1700-1721), Norway and Denmark endeavoured to get even with Sweden; Sweden being defeated in the war, Denmark and Norway were successful in securing temporary possession of Schleswig.

In the gigantic wars between Prussia, Russia, France,

Austria and England, in the second and third quarters of the Eighteenth Century, the small Denmark and Norway were wise enough to stand aloof. But the two countries were dragged by their big neighbours into the wars against Revolutionary and Napoleonic France, and on Napoleon's fall Denmark and Norway were compelled to sever their union of four centuries, and Norway was ceded to Sweden. The Norwegians resisted this transfer of their citizenship, but resistance was crushed by Sweden's army. They were never reconciled, naturally, to this disposition of their political destiny and after twenty years of constitutional struggle they secured by a bloodless revolution, in 1905, their complete independence of Sweden.

During recent years, since its restored independence, Norway has been among the foremost nations in advocating the substitution of the peace-method. It maintained its neutrality under immense difficulties and provocations from both sides during the World War; and since the war came to an end, it has arbitrated before the Hague Court its claim for damages against the United States for the requisition of Norwegian ships for military purposes. It was represented at both Hague Conferences, in 1899 and 1907, and was most energetic in organizing and urging the adoption of the various peaceful means agreed upon by those conferences for the settlement of international disputes. Recent months have seen in Norway a strong movement in favour of disarmament, a policy which the Norwegian delegates consistently press upon the League of Nations also.

Denmark

The military history of Denmark is that of Norway during their union of four centuries, from 1397 to 1815. Before this fortunate union, Denmark had known a great deal of warfare, and much of it was with Norway.

Before the dawn of history, the Teutonic Angles, Saxons and Jutes invaded Denmark, conquered its inhabitants and settled there. In the Fifth and Sixth Centuries, these

Teutons migrated with the others, conquered Roman and Celtic England, and settled there, while the Danes came in from the Baltic islands to live in the former homes of the emigrants.

After the first swarms of Teutonic invaders had settled within the Roman provinces and become partly civilized and Christianized, a huge swarm of later barbarians harassed Europe, and of these the Danes were among the most energetic and destructive. They fought the Norwegians, their fellow freebooters, the Slavs, the Germans and the French; and they appear to have formed the majority of the Northern raiders of England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, for the English knew them all as "the Danes." After periods of raids and settlement in England, they conquered it and ruled it for a generation under King Canute and his sons.

This temporary success led the succeeding kings of Denmark to renewed efforts to conquer and rule over Norway, Prussia, the Hanseatic League of commercial cities, and the Slavs; hence, for 300 years longer the history of Denmark is largely one of civil and foreign war, and continued misery and destitution. Then came the union of Denmark, Norway and Sweden, and for four more centuries Denmark's military exploits became less numerous and her peaceful progress correspondingly more rapid.

In the days of our American Revolution, Denmark joined the Armed Neutrality alliance and demanded that the rights of neutrals on the sea be respected by Great Britain. Twenty years later, during Great Britain's war with France under Napoleon, this alliance was renewed, and England, determined to prevent the Danish fleet from joining that of Napoleon, sent Admiral Nelson with the British fleet to destroy that of Denmark under the fortress-guns of Copenhagen. This Nelson did (1801); and a half-dozen years later, when Denmark was not even in a state of armed neutrality and was doing its utmost to keep out of the war of the giants, England again sent her fleet to Copen-

hagen to demand that Denmark should join England and place her new fleet in the war against Napoleon. Denmark refused to comply with the demand, whereupon the British fleet bombarded Copenhagen and carried off the Danish fleet to England.¹

This act forced Denmark into the Napoleonic War on the side of France; and when Napoleon fell, Denmark was punished by being compelled to cede Norway to Sweden. As partial compensation for Norway, Denmark received some land in the Duchy of Schleswig-Holstein; but only a generation passed before Denmark was involved in a series of three wars for the purpose of compelling the German population of the Duchy to accept Danish sovereignty. This being accomplished (1852), a dozen years later Austria and Prussia fought Denmark and compelled her to surrender Schleswig-Holstein to the victors,—and two years later Austria and Prussia fought each other for the spoils!

Denmark, like her small neighbours, Norway, Sweden and Holland, was determined to maintain neutrality during the World War, and succeeded in doing so, though with great difficulty and with much economic loss and popular suffering. At the end of the war, she behaved with great moderation also, and at the Peace of Paris not only refrained from demanding the return of all of Schleswig and Holstein, but insisted that Holstein and part of Schleswig should be conceded to Germany without a vote of their inhabitants, whom she recognized as Germans, and that a vote should be taken only in that part of Schleswig where she believed the majority of the inhabitants were Danes.

This application of the peace-method, namely, the self-determination of peoples and not coercion by governments, has put Denmark with Norway in the forefront of the nations struggling to substitute the peace-method for the

¹ It is illustrative of the hold which the war-method has upon the minds and morals of men that one of England's ablest and most honest historians should call this outrageous act "an act of moral daring," and should say of it: "Whether right or wrong, it bears the imprint of genius!"

war-method; and Denmark's long, sad experience through centuries of war, should aid greatly in keeping her loyal and active in the peace-cause. Her liberal treatment of Iceland, extending almost to the granting of independence; and the drastic reduction of her armaments, extending almost to disarmament, are recent evidences of her pacific principles.

Holland

The Netherlands, or Low Lands, as Holland and Belgium have long been called, have been for many centuries the theater of two kinds of struggle, namely, the struggle of man with nature, and of man with man.

The struggle of man with nature has been a heroic and splendidly successful one, resulting in the reclaiming of thousands of acres of fertile lands from the salt waters of the North Sea and from the swampy mouths of the North European rivers. Century after century, these brave and skilful people have built their windmills, pumped the sea and river waters from their lands, developed a magnificent system of dykes to keep out the stormy waves of the North Sea, built an extensive system of canals to prevent the rivers from oozing over their farms and to carry them into the ocean; and here, on the site of former sea-marshes and submerged lands, they have created gardens and built prosperous homes and thriving towns.

Alas, that this splendid and marvellous record should be marred by the trail of many bloody wars! We know not through what scenes of misery and death this trail led before the dawn of history; but we know that in prehistoric times the Northern Netherlands, or what we now call Holland, were the scene of long continued war between the aboriginal inhabitants, the Celts and the Teutons.

History lifts the curtain from the Netherlanders in the days of Julius Cæsar (57 B. C.), who tells the story of his conquest of the Belgians and other tribes, all of whom were terribly beaten and some of them annihilated by the superiority of Roman arms and military "science." The Nether-

landers then submitted to the rule of the Roman Empire, but a century later burst into a formidable revolt, under their Romanized leader, Claudius Civilis, who defeated several Roman armies and marched far into Gaul. Civilis even dreamed of founding a Gallic Empire to rival that of Rome; but Rome's civilized forces and the jealousies of the Batavians, Gauls and Germans who formed the army of Civilis, were too much for him and the revolt was stamped out by the Roman legions in blood and fire.

The Netherlands then shared the fate of the Roman province of Gaul and were overrun and conquered by the Teutonic tribes, especially by the Franks. Charlemagne made them an integral part of his empire, and when his empire fell to pieces, they were associated chiefly with Germany. The Duke of Lorraine, and later the Duke of Burgundy struggled through the mediæval centuries with the various counts and bishops who claimed the right to rule over various parts of the land.

By purchase, by bequest, and especially by war, seventeen provinces in the Netherlands fell into the hands of the Austrian Hapsburgs, one of whom, Charles V, united them with the Holy Roman Empire of Germany, and then bequeathed them to his son, Philip II, King of Spain. This King was determined to root the Protestant heresy out of the Netherlands and restore Catholicism, and also to replace self-government by an absolute rule. The Netherlands resisted this programme, and there ensued the frightfully bloody and cruel Eighty Years' War (1568-1648). Our American historian, John Lothrop Motley, has written a lurid account of the details of battle, siege, massacre, oppression of many kinds, the sack of cities, the cutting of the dykes and the drowning of the land, which accompanied this terrible war. In the course of it, the southern provinces of the Netherlands, which were chiefly Catholic, separated from the northern provinces, which were chiefly Protestant, and from this time their history divides into that of Holland and Belgium.

At the end of the Eighty Years' War, in the Peace of Westphalia, the Spaniards recognized the independence of the northern provinces, which had formed the Dutch Republic of the United Provinces, or Holland. This republic prospered greatly on land and sea, and its commercial and naval growth led to a rivalry with England, and to three naval wars between the two countries. First one side and then the other would gain a temporary victory at sea, and first one fleet and then the other would invade the rivers and attack the river-towns of "the enemy." Finally, to make "peace," Holland was compelled to surrender to England its colony of New Netherland in New York and New Jersey.

But the result of the struggle for colonial and naval supremacy had not been decided when Holland was attacked by Louis XIV, King of France, who aspired to annex to France the Netherlands on the northeast and Spain on the southwest, and to secure the French domination of Europe. Like Philip II, Louis XIV attempted to crush Protestantism and restore Western Europe to the Catholic Church, and to replace popular government everywhere by the absolute rule and the "divine right" of kings. England and Holland were both Protestant and both ruled by representative parliaments; but Charles II, King of England, was secretly a Catholic and a believer in absolute monarchy and he therefore made a secret alliance with France. This kept England neutral while the French were invading and conquering Holland; but before Louis had completed his conquest, he stirred up Germany and Sweden against him, and he was forced to content himself for the time with most of the southern Netherlands.

During the third and fourth wars of aggression waged by Louis XIV, Holland and England (which were united for a time under the same king) fought with his other European foes against him. For nearly fifty years these wars of aggression lasted, and spread over all of Europe, involving even the Turk, over the Atlantic and the French and Eng-

lish colonies which were struggling for bare existence in the wilds of the New World. "Famous victories" and great reputations were won and lost by such men as William of Orange, Marlborough and Turenne; but then as always in war the plain people and world's real workers bore the heavy burden of disease and death, poverty and famine. Holland exhausted its resources in the long struggle and lost all chance of competing with England for colonial possessions in the New World and for maritime and naval equality on the oceans. She spent most of the Eighteenth Century in recuperating her strength and in developing what colonies were left to her in the East Indies.

When the French Revolution burst upon Europe, Holland was drawn into the war against France, and was conquered by the French armies. Under Napoleon, it formed the so-called Batavian Republic; but it was really made a part of Napoleon's empire, and was compelled to participate as much as it could in his wars. Its fleet was destroyed and its colonies were conquered by the British, and its commerce was ruined by Napoleon's policy of blockade. For four years it was ruled by Louis Bonaparte, whom his brother Napoleon made King of Holland; but when Louis refused to ruin Holland by adhering longer to Napoleon's policies of war and blockade, Napoleon drove Louis out and annexed Holland to France, claiming that its soil was merely "the deposits of French rivers"!

When the European peoples finally brushed their corrupt and inefficient governments aside and rose en masse against the French invaders and despots, the Dutch joined in the war which caused Napoleon's downfall. As a "reward" for this, the former republic of Holland was converted into a kingdom, and to it were added the southern Netherlands, which had formerly been ruled by Austria, but which were now designed to strengthen Holland as a bulwark against France.

This union lasted for only fifteen years, however, and then the southern Netherlands revolted and, with the aid

of France, England and Germany, secured their independence from Holland and established their own Kingdom of Belgium. The King of Holland resisted this separation, prosecuted a war against the "rebels," and when he was compelled by his big neighbours to consent to peace, refused for nine years to recognize Belgium's independence.

During the rest of the Nineteenth Century, as in the Eighteenth, Holland recuperated her strength after long and exhausting war, and succeeded in maintaining neutrality in the midst of the wars waged by her big neighbours. When the World War broke out in 1914, Holland was still afraid of being conquered, on the one side by Germany, or on the other by the French army and the British fleet, and, like a burnt child which fears the fire, she was determined if possible to avoid being again ground to powder in a war of the giants. She did succeed in keeping out of the war, with great difficulty and large loss of property, and like the other small European lands which maintained their neutrality (Switzerland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden), was far less crushed than the rest of that wretched continent.

During the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), when the rest of Europe was tearing itself to pieces, a wise Hollander, Hugo Grotius by name, wrote a book which denounced the brutalities and follies of war, demanded that they be curbed by international law, and advocated the substitution of the peace-method, in the form of arbitration. This book ("De jure belli ac pacis") founded the science of international law and gradually exerted a profound influence upon the minds of Europeans, especially Grotius' fellow-Hollanders. It was most appropriate, therefore, that the two Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907, which were called for the purpose of reducing the evils of war and of substituting for it the peace-method, should have met at The Hague, the capital of Holland. Here too has been erected that beautiful building, the Peace Palace, in which meet the International Court of Arbitration and the International Court of Justice. These courts have already settled about thirty in-

ternational disputes, and the sad world now devoutly hopes they will be able to settle all other disputes between the nations by the peaceful methods which must take the place of war, if civilization and human life itself is to endure.

Belgium

The military history of the Belgians has been told in connection with that of Holland, down to the separation of the northern and southern Netherlands in 1579. Philip II's generals, the Duke of Alva and the Prince of Parma, broke the spirit of the Belgians and compelled their submission to Spain. Unlike the Dutch, they were chiefly Catholic and largely industrial, and accepted a reunion with Spain on condition of local self-government.

For two centuries after this, Belgium shared the declining fortunes of militaristic Spain; and when Spain entered upon its numerous wars, Belgium was usually the first part of the Spanish realm to be attacked, the last to be given peace, and some part of its territory was usually ceded by defeated Spain to the victor. In the four wars of aggression precipitated upon Western Europe by Louis XIV (1667-1713), and in the war between France and Spain which preceded these (1643-1659), the Belgian provinces of Spain were so frequently the scene of battle and siege, devastation and massacre, that they were known as "the cockpit of Europe."

On the fall of Louis XIV, the Spanish Netherlands were transferred to Austria, and were thereafter called the Austrian Netherlands, sharing for eighty years some of Austria's military attempts and failures. Particularly during an eight years' war between Austria and France, 1740-1748, Belgium was invaded, conquered and sadly devastated by the French.

When the French Revolution began, the Belgians were again conquered by the French, and this time they were annexed, first to the French Republic and then to Napoleon's Empire. Belgium and its people then shared in the wars

which raged for more than twenty years (1793-1815), being especially a source of recruits and supplies to Napoleon during his incessant warfare. At last, it was on Belgian soil, at Waterloo, near Brussels, that the final battle in the long series was fought, and Napoleon's bloody career was ended.

On Napoleon's fall, the Allies at the Congress of Vienna neither restored the Belgian Netherlands to Austria, nor gave them an independent government; but, desiring to build a strong bulwark against future French aggression, they united them with the Northern Netherlands under the King of Holland.

Since the Belgians differed so greatly from the Dutch in religion, language, industry and culture, this union was not a happy one. It continued for fifteen years, and then the Belgians fought a brief war of independence, assisted by France and England, against Holland.

To save the new Kingdom of the Belgians from future conquest by any one of its big neighbours, France, Great Britain and Prussia guaranteed its neutralization. That is to say, on condition that Belgium should maintain forts and armies only for defensive purposes and should engage in no war of offense, its big neighbours promised to refrain from invading its territory in any war which they might fight against each other, and promised also that if any one of them should invade Belgium the other two would go to the assistance of Belgium against the invader.

Under the cover of this treaty of neutralization, Belgium avoided the wars of the big powers which disgraced the rest of the Nineteenth Century. But through the ambition of its king, it was drawn into the big powers' game of imperialism and took over a vast realm and population of "backward people" in Africa. Here, in the Congo "Free State," was perpetrated some of the most outrageous exploitation of helpless peoples that has disgraced the history of our time. War, kidnapping, compulsory labour, ruthless oppression of many kinds were inflicted upon the

Negroes, until the moral conscience of mankind revolted and reforms were slowly and reluctantly introduced.

When the World War began, the Germans sought to avoid the fortresses on the Franco-German frontier and to strike France swiftly down before the Russians could start the Slavic avalanche rolling upon Germany. Hence they regarded the Belgian treaty of neutralization as a "scrap of paper" in comparison with this so-called "military necessity," and violated international law and morality by invading Belgium. Belgium fought back as best it could, and received the aid of France and Great Britain; but it was almost entirely conquered by the Germans and became throughout the four fatal years a part of "the line of intrenchments."

More than a quarter-million Belgians were slain in the battles of the World War and 150,000 were reported as wounded, captured or "missing." How many Belgians fell victims of exile, deportation and oppression, is not known; but it is known that a part of the Belgian frontier lands were devastated and a serious blow was struck at her industry and prosperity.

In consequence of this war, the Belgian government, if not the people, lost confidence in that fallacious peace-method known as neutralization backed up by military guarantee; it accordingly repudiated the treaty of neutralization and sought safety from outside attack through a military alliance with France. Under French leadership, also, it aided in the task of bringing military pressure to bear on Germany in the Ruhr valley with the object of compelling Germany to pay reparations for the damages committed by its armies in France and Belgium during the war.

There are signs, however, that in Belgium itself there is a growing belief that the war-method is a terribly dangerous one for any country, and especially a small one surrounded by big rivals; hence if the Belgian people can secure control of their government, Belgium will doubtless

join heartily in the world's future effort to substitute a genuine peace-method for the hoary iniquity of war and military alliances which has left a trail of death and desolation through many centuries on Flanders' fields and Belgium's boroughs.

Switzerland

The ring of Alpine mountains have been a great protection to Switzerland against invading armies; but in spite of them, the Swiss have known much of warfare both outside and within their mountain-ring.

We know not what wars ran their course in the Swiss valleys during the prehistoric times; but they were doubtless the scene of many a bloody combat, first between the aborigines and the invading Celts, and then between the Celts and the Teutonic tribes who drove them westward.

About 100 B. C., the curtain of history is lifted and we find the Teutons of Switzerland, known to the Romans as the Helvetians, participating in a mighty raid or migration across the Alps into Northern Italy. Here the vast horde of barbarians met the trained legions of the Roman dictator, Caius Marius, and were almost annihilated, men, women and children, by the Roman short swords and cavalry. Despite this terrible lesson, we find other bands of Helvetians, a half-century later, invading Gaul and being beaten back by Julius Cæsar.

After this second failure at foreign conquest, the Swiss remained within their mountain fastnesses, slowly learning civilization and Christianity from their Roman and Frankish neighbours. Feudal lords from France and Germany, also, set up their claims to land and government among the Swiss peasants, and the Austrian Hapsburgs especially were determined to compel them to submit to their rule and their taxation.

After many quarrels with the Hapsburg claimants some of the Swiss cantons formed a union, about 1200 A. D., and determined to secure their independence. Since their Aus-

trian dukes were busily engaged in war elsewhere and were in frequent conflict with the German emperors and with the cities in their own dominion, the Swiss found their task a comparatively easy one. They were obliged to fight several battles, however, in one of which the peasant infantry of Switzerland surprised the Austrian cavalry in a narrow pass between mountain and lake and killed 1,500 of them.

Even more successful than battle, in the Swiss struggle for independence, was purchase and union. The people gradually bought up from lords, bishops and abbots their claims to govern, and as the cantons became locally independent republics they joined together in a confederation which was practically independent of outside governments for three hundred years before its independence was formally recognized.

Unfortunately, the religious wars between the Catholics and Protestants were engaged in by the Swiss as well as by their neighbours, and these brought both civil and foreign war in their train. Some of the cantons were Protestant and some were Catholic, and a civil war broke out between them; one side allied itself with Austria, the old hereditary enemy of all the Swiss, and when the allied Austrian and Swiss troops were defeated they called on France for aid. Before this double alliance, the other Swiss party was obliged to yield, 1,400 of their number being killed in a single battle.

Meanwhile, another powerful neighbour of the Swiss, the Duke of Burgundy, revived the dream of creating a great power between France and Germany which should rival or overtop both of them. He accordingly endeavoured to unite under his rule all the middle lands between the North Sea and the Mediterranean. This included Switzerland, and the Swiss again found themselves engaged in a war for independence. Three bloody battles were fought within a year between the Swiss infantry and the Burgundian cavalry, the latter were completely defeated, the Duke was slain, and after his death his duchy was annexed by France.

But this escape from Burgundian domination did not save Switzerland from the renewal of the civil war. The Catholic and Protestant cantons were again arrayed against each other, and again one party appealed to the Catholics of Austria for aid and the other appealed to the Protestants of Germany. One desperate battle was fought, and in it were slain many brave and conscientious Swiss on both sides, including the great Swiss reformer, Ulrich Zwingli.

This war was indecisive of the cause for which either side fought, and it left bitter memories which rankled in Swiss hearts and caused Swiss dissension for generations. Even more disastrous for Switzerland, perhaps, was what Zwingli considered its worst disease and chief weakness, namely, the fact that it had been for generations the recruiting ground for Emperor, King and Pope in their perpetual struggle for the domination of Italy. The military "glory" which the Swiss peasants had won in war against foreign invaders, caused them to be eagerly sought for and purchased as mercenary troops in the armies of Germany, France and the Pope. The youthful mountaineers sold their service to the highest bidder and fought, first under one banner and then under the opposing one, and even against their own fellow-countrymen. This evil custom continued for three hundred years, sapping Switzerland's strength and infusing the poison of militarism into the blood of its peasants.

When the French Revolution burst forth, Swiss hired troops were slain in Paris in defense of the French king against the French people; and in Switzerland itself the aristocrats who were in control of the government, expelled from the country all who publicly sympathized with the French republic, and gave an asylum and base of operations against France to the exiled French noblemen intent on overthrowing the French republic and restoring the monarchy.

The French revolutionists endured this state of affairs for several years, but then sent an army into Switzerland and, after some fighting, changed the Swiss confederation into

the Helvetian Republic which henceforth was a satellite of France under Napoleon. The French took as the spoils of victory, also, the city and canton of Geneva; and Switzerland, having lost its neutrality by siding first with the foes of France and then with France, became a battle-ground, a cemetery, and a highway of foreign armies. Napoleon built his highways across the Alps and led his soldiers back and forth across Switzerland in his expeditions against Italy and Austria; he interfered repeatedly, also, in the civil dissensions which tore Switzerland asunder, and made of it practically a dependency of France.

On Napoleon's fall, Geneva was restored to Switzerland, and the old confederation was reëstablished; but the old feud between democrats and aristocrats was not settled, and in the revolutionary days of 1847-48 another civil war was fought. In this the democrats gained the victory, and set up the modern Republic of Switzerland.

The Swiss democracy, having learned the sad lesson of its own and other countries' history, determined to do its utmost to avoid warfare in the future. The Congress of Vienna, in order to prevent France from again utilizing Switzerland as a base of operation, as had been the case under Napoleon, declared that Switzerland should remain perpetually neutral, that she should engage in no alliance or offensive war, and that her territory should never be invaded or crossed by the armies of other warring countries. Great Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia guaranteed this neutralization, and in the wars of the Nineteenth Century it was observed by outsiders and steadfastly adhered to by the Swiss.

Since the Swiss population is made up of German-speaking, French-speaking and Italian-speaking elements, it would have been suicidal for them to have participated on either side in the World War; civil war, if not foreign conquest, would have ruined and perhaps ended the Swiss Republic. Not only did it preserve its neutrality with the most scrupulous care during the war, but, unlike Belgium, it has

been all the more determined since the war to maintain its neutrality in the future.

It has long been the land of refuge for Europeans fleeing from fields of battle, or exiled from their home-lands for a variety of reasons. This fact, together with its proximity to the bloody wars of the Nineteenth Century and its neutrality, made it a land of beneficent internationalism. It welcomed to Geneva the tribunal of arbitration which settled the dangerous dispute between the United States and Great Britain over the *Alabama* Claims; and it took the lead in establishing the Geneva rules designed to care for the dead and injured on battle-fields on land and sea, these rules being popularly called throughout the world the Red Cross Rules in compliment to Switzerland, the Swiss flag being a white cross on a red field.

It was also in recognition of Switzerland's international and peace-loving character that the Conference of Paris, in 1919, decided upon Geneva, instead of Brussels, as the headquarters of the League of Nations. Geneva has long been a center of coöperation among the nations along the lines of humanitarian and scientific endeavour; and, whether the League of Nations continues to exist or not, it is destined to remain the headquarters of that beneficent coöperation among the nations which must increase and multiply if the world's progress is to continue and the world's peace is to be preserved. If the League of Nations is to continue and grow stronger in the preservation of world-peace by purely peaceful means, as well as to promote the world's real work in time of peace itself, the little Swiss town of Geneva will be increasingly regarded as "the world-capital," a title which it already proudly claims.

Spain

The Spanish Peninsula was brought within the ken of history when the Phœnicians planted colonies in Southern Spain, or Tarshish, and at Gades (Cadiz) beyond the "Columns of Hercules," or the Strait of Gibraltar. This

was about 1100 B. C.; and for centuries before this, the Iberians, the Celts, and other prehistoric inhabitants doubtless strove with one another for possession of the land.

These went down before the Phœnicians of Tyre and Sidon, and they in turn were supplanted by the Carthaginians. When the Carthaginians and Romans fell into their life-and-death struggle, Spain became a principal theater of the war. For a quarter of a century, the Carthaginians made Spain a source of supplies and a recruiting and training ground for their armies, and Hannibal used it as his base of operations against the Romans in Italy. The Romans carried the war into Spain and conquered it from the Carthaginians, after a decade of bloody fighting; but the Spaniards themselves fiercely resisted the Roman supremacy, and nearly another century of conquest and suppression of revolts was necessary to establish Roman rule.

In the Roman civil wars between Marius and Sulla, Cæsar and Pompey, and Octavian and Antony, Spain was again for another half-century the scene of almost incessant battles, sieges, and massacres. Having "made a desert and called it peace," the Roman Empire colonized, civilized and tyrannized over Spain for four hundred years, when the fate of the Empire overtook Spain along with the other provinces.

Numerous bands of Teutonic barbarians fought their way into Spain and, after conquering its Romanized inhabitants, were themselves conquered, first by the Suevi and Alani, then by the Vandals, and finally by the West Goths. The West Goths established a kingdom in the peninsula, with Toledo as its capital, and during the next three hundred years suppressed revolts from within, fought off foes from without and, although their royal family had a peculiarly savage and bloody career, they were themselves partially civilized and Christianized.

But the Mohammedan storm from Arabia moved rapidly across North Africa and the Strait of Gibraltar and burst upon Spain. And then for nearly *eight hundred years*,—

from 711 A. D. when the West Gothic Kingdom was destroyed by the Mohammedan Moors, until 1492 when the last Moorish stronghold at Granada was recaptured by the Christians,—Spain was the scene of civil, religious and racial warfare! Century after century, battle and siege and all the horrors of guerilla warfare swept across the valleys and mountains. The Moors were at first almost everywhere successful, and the Spaniards were driven out of the fertile plains and broad valleys into their mountain fastnesses. A score of years after their first successful battle in Spain, the Moors pushed on across the Pyrenees into Southern France, but were repulsed by the armies of Charles Martel. Charles's grandson, Charlemagne, invaded Northern Spain, in turn, and inflicted some losses on the Moors; but his own army was attacked on its retreat by the Celt-Iberians of the Pyrenees and lost its rear-guard under Roland.

The Song of Roland and the series of romances associated with his and Charlemagne's name are typical of the warlike legends and traditions which grew up around the bloody border and guerilla warfare which stained for so many centuries the annals of the Spanish and the Moorish people. Such stories as those of Ruy Diaz, the Cid, on the Spanish side, and of Almanzor, on the Moorish side, are indicative of the natural desire of people and poets to cast all possible glamour of romance and idealism over the prosaic, sordid and brutal record of eight centuries of almost incessant fighting and devastation.

With such a military history, it might well be supposed that Spain would have lost all vestiges of civilization and relapsed into utter barbarism. But, besides the Phœnician and Roman civilization which had been planted firmly in the peninsula, and which had conquered invader after invader, the invading Moors brought with them the Hellenistic culture of Northern Africa and Egypt and the Spaniards borrowed much of it from their Mohammedan foes even while fighting and despising them.

With the decline of the Mohammedan Arabs in the East and of the Moors in the West, the power of the Spaniards waxed strong; they allied themselves with Mohammedans in Morocco, and in Spain they got together into petty kingdoms, which were finally united into a single kingdom about the time when the last Moorish stronghold fell into their hands. At this time, too, Christopher Columbus made his famous voyage under the Spanish flag, and he and his successors brought to Spain the gold and silver of the West Indies and claims to the lands and people of the Western World.

In pursuit of these claims and of the precious metals, the Spaniards brought a train of wars and oppression to the New World and left a lurid trail of death, suffering and destruction behind them. Massacre, slavery, exploitation of every kind, were the gifts which they mingled with all of the vices and some of the virtues of civilization, in their dealings with the more backward and feebler Indians.

No sooner had the Spaniards founded their empire in the New World than it was challenged by the French and the English, and there ensued a series of wars, first with the French, then with the English, then with the South Americans, and finally with the people of the United States. After four hundred years of futile warfare, governmental tyranny and manifold atrocities, the Spanish empire in the New World came to an inglorious end.

Meanwhile, at home, Spain was involved in many wars with her European neighbours. Her ambition to acquire more land in the Old World as well as in the New led her to join France in a war against Naples (1501), which kingdom they conquered. The two victors then quarrelled over the spoils, and Spain fought France and seized Naples (1504). The French then attempted to seize lands in Northern Italy and Spain joined with her and the Pope in a war against Venice (1508); but when France became too successful, Spain and the Pope joined Venice in a war against France and drove her out of Italy (1511-13).

The Protestant Revolution then began, and the King of Spain, who was also Emperor of Germany and Archduke of Austria, put himself at the head of the Catholics and engaged in several wars to suppress the Protestant heresy. The mutual jealousy and rivalry between Spain and France continued, however, and while the Spanish king was endeavouring to suppress the Protestants, he was at the same time engaged in five wars with France and her allies, the Pope and the Turks, which raged with various fortunes in France, Italy, the Spanish Netherlands, and elsewhere on land and sea.

Some of the Spanish Netherlands were converted to Protestantism, and all of them were opposed to Spanish despotism, so that they all revolted and started the Eighty Years' War of Liberation, which has already been described in connection with Holland.¹ This war involved Spain in wars with England and France, also; as well as with her Dutch and Belgian subjects. In these she lost her so-called "Invincible Armada" (1588), which was sent to conquer England,² and wasted many lives on land attacks upon and within France,³ egging on the ferocious Wars of Religion between French Catholics and French Protestants. Spain was called upon at the same time, to suppress a twelve years' revolt of her own subjects in Catalonia; and, although she annexed Portugal at the beginning of these many years of war, she was obliged to submit at the end of them to Portugal's reassertion of her independence.

No sooner had the Protestants of Holland practically secured from Spain in the Eighty Years' War their political independence and religious freedom, than the Protestants of Germany attempted to secure the same from the Spanish house of Austria, and the Thirty Years' War ensued (1618-1648). Spain joined in this war on the side of the Catholics and of Austria; but the old rivalry between Spain and France flared up again, and religious motives were lost sight of in political and territorial ambition. Hence Catholic

¹ See page 73.

² See page 254.

³ See page 163.

France joined Protestant Germany and fought against Catholic Spain and Austria. Even after the German Protestants and Catholic Austrians made peace, the war between Catholic Spain and Catholic France continued for another dozen years (until 1659), and during its last three years Protestant England joined in it on the side of France.

Peace did not last long between the two rivals, for eight years later Spain was involved in the first of a series of four wars which King Louis XIV forced upon Europe, and which lasted for nearly a half-century (1667-1714). The first three wars were fought over the possession of the Spanish Netherlands, and the last of them, the so-called War of the Spanish Succession, was with the object of placing Louis XIV's grandson upon the throne of Spain. Not only France and Spain, but also England, Holland, Austria, Prussia, Italy, Portugal and America were involved in these wars which were fought out in many parts of Europe and America and on the lakes and oceans of the Old World and the new. Their final result was to place on the Spanish throne the grandson of Louis XIV and the House of Bourbon; but Spain suffered a bloody chastisement from those who had sided against the French claimant, the reintroduction of despotic government, and the loss of the Spanish Netherlands, the Kingdom of Naples, and other lands in Northern Italy which Spain had seized or claimed.

To regain these losses, the new Spanish king started another war, three years later, and brought into alliance against him the Quadruple Alliance, which included England, Holland, Germany and even France! Spain was speedily obliged to make peace, and the chief result of this attempt was the loss, to England, of the fortress of Gibraltar which commands the entrance to the Mediterranean Sea and supplies a strong base of military operation against Spain itself.

These tragic experiences did not prevent Spain from participating as much as she could in the various wars of the Eighteenth Century. In the Polish Succession War (1733-

35), she fought on the side of France against Russia and Austria. In the Austrian Succession War (1739-48), she fought on the side of France against England and Austria. In the Seven Years' War (1756-63), she fought on the side of France against England and most of Europe. And in the American Revolutionary War, she fought on the side of France and the United States against England.

In the first two of these wars, Spain's chief object was to acquire more lands in Italy; in the third, she desired to retain her lands in North America (Florida and Louisiana); and in the last, she endeavoured to regain Gibraltar. But in Italy, Spain had to yield to Austria; in America, she was compelled by Napoleon to cede Louisiana to France, and was obliged to sell Florida to the United States; while England was successful in maintaining her clutches on Gibraltar.

When the French Revolution burst forth, the Bourbon king of Spain joined with his fellow-monarchs of England, Austria and Germany in the bloody wars against France. But when Napoleon rose to power, he sent a French army into Spain, drove the Bourbons from the throne, and placed upon it his brother Joseph. The Spanish people resented this exchange of Bourbon for Bonapartist kings and rose in arms against the French invaders. England sent to their aid an army under the command of the Duke of Wellington, and there ensued for a half-dozen years (1808-1814) the Peninsular War.

During this war, the peninsula of Spain and Portugal was overrun by French, Italian, German, Polish, and British troops, marching and retreating, fighting battles and sieges, and devouring the substance of the Spanish people; while the people themselves did their utmost to recruit and supply their own guerilla troops, who engaged in all the desperate and destructive deeds usually associated with guerilla warfare.

The war ended with the overthrow of Napoleon and his brother Joseph, and with the restoration of the Bourbon

kings. But Spain had lost all chance of regaining her power in Italy and the Netherlands, and nearly all of her colonies in America had asserted and practically achieved their independence.

The Bourbons brought back with them despotic government, and against this the Spanish people arose repeatedly in furious revolts (1820, 1823, 1868-75). The first of these was partially successful in securing constitutional government, at least in name. The second was suppressed by a French army, which had been sent in to Spain at the king's request by the Austrian, Russian and Prussian sovereigns acting as the so-called Holy Alliance. And the third was temporarily successful in driving the Bourbons out and replacing them by kings of the royal house of Italy.

A prince of the Prussian House of Hohenzollern was chosen at one time as the Spanish king, but this caused France to demand his withdrawal, and it led finally to the terrible war of 1870-71 between France and Prussia. The Italian king who had been forced upon them proved unsatisfactory to the Spanish people, and they again rose in rebellion, drove him out, and proclaimed a republic. But the republic was handicapped from the start by anarchy and civil war, and the Bourbons were strong enough, with foreign aid, to suppress the republic and restore the monarchy (1875), which still exists in Spain.

The throne of Spain has been ever since, however, a very shaky and uncertain seat. It is assailed on one side by republican and socialistic movements, both of which have grown stronger and stronger within recent years; and on the other by the demand of the militarists for more iron rule at home, and for foreign conquest abroad, in Asia, Africa and America. The militarists had their way in maintaining for many years a series of wars against the people of Cuba, who strove to follow the example of the other Spanish-Americans by securing their independence. These wars and the ruthless cruelties perpetrated in them finally led to a war with the United States (1898), and the result of this

was the loss of all the rest of Spain's empire in America and in Asia as well (the Philippines, etc.).

For some years afterward, these losses appeared to be a blessing in disguise; for it was thought that Spain, awaking from its long dreams "of conquest and of glory," would settle down to the concentrated development of the rich natural resources in its own peninsula, and the possibilities of intellectual, religious, political and industrial progress among its own people.

It did profit enough by the bitter experiences of its war-like past to refrain from participating either for or against France, its ancient foe and ally, in the recent World War; and like the other European countries which maintained their neutrality, it did not suffer ruin, though it did suffer considerable loss of property. But before and since the World War, the Spanish militarists insisted that Spain should again strive for "empire beyond seas," this time in Morocco. They partially gained their way, and Spanish armies have continued a desultory and fluctuating warfare with the tribesmen of Morocco. An expeditionary force of 80,000 soldiers is still maintained there by Spain. This is wasteful of life and property, in itself; it causes constant rivalry and jealousy between Spain and France, which is also engaged in a long-drawn-out war to enforce authority in Morocco; it has given autocratic power in Spain to the military leader; and, worst of all, it is the pretext used for reviving and maintaining the love of warfare and the lust of conquest in the hearts of the Spanish people.

Glancing back over the three thousand years of Spanish history, one can readily see why it is strikingly illustrative of the evils of warfare and militarism. Illiteracy, poverty, idleness, intolerance, superstition, cruelty and the arrogant pride of ignorance, are still characteristic of the great mass of the Spanish people; and these are all preëminently the fruits of war and militarism. Even in the days of Spain's so-called glorious ascendancy, after Columbus and his successors had given to her a New World and a flood of gold

and silver, her greatness was hollow,—vitiated by the weaknesses and vices fastened upon her by centuries of war. For example, she celebrated her final victory in the eight centuries of war against the Mohammedans, by expelling nearly a million Moors and Jews, whom historians regard as the most learned and industrious of her inhabitants.¹ And during the wars of religion which she waged soon afterwards against her own heretics and against other Protestant peoples, she established in both her European and American domains the terrible Inquisition, which was designed to suppress by violence freedom of religion and freedom of thought. By this instrument of cruelty, tyranny and hypocrisy, she not only destroyed the lives of hundreds of thousands of her most able and enterprising citizens, but she put the minds of her other citizens into a strait-jacket which crushed out all initiative and desire for progress.

Portugal

Portugal, the Western slice of the Spanish peninsula, shared throughout prehistoric times and for more than two thousand historic years the warlike history of Spain. About 1100 A. D., the Count of Portugal declared his county independent of the Spanish kingdoms and proclaimed himself a king.

The small kingdom had a precarious existence for the next three centuries, situated as it was between the Spaniards and Moors on three sides and the deep, blue sea on the other. But it finally turned from warfare on the land, and entered upon a fine period in its history by becoming the pioneer in ocean navigation and exploration. For nearly a century before Columbus, Prince Henry, of Portugal, famed in history as "The Navigator," gave such stimulus

¹ One natural result of this expulsion has been the spread of bitter hatred of the Europeans among the Moslems of Africa and Asia. Curses like chickens come home to roost, and Europe's contests with the Mohammedans, especially in Morocco, have been made far more difficult during the centuries since this expulsion was inflicted.

to navigation that Portuguese sailors discovered the islands in the Atlantic off the coast of Africa, and in voyage after voyage slowly advanced around the great, dark continent itself, until at last (1498) Vasco da Gama sailed beyond its southernmost point and up through the Indian Ocean to India.

This great feat of ocean navigation opened up again to Western Europe the rich trade with India, which had been closed by the Turks when they captured Constantinople and the Eastern Mediterranean (1453). It succeeded, thus, in doing what Columbus in his otherwise memorable voyage of 1492 had failed to do; and twenty years later (1519-22), another great Portuguese navigator, Magellan, sailing this time under the Spanish flag, led the first expedition which made its way across the Atlantic and Pacific, westward to India, and on around the world.

Meanwhile, in 1500, another Portuguese mariner, Cabral, had sailed, or been blown out of his course, to the South American coast,¹ and on the basis of his voyages Portugal claimed Brazil. Not content with scientific discovery and commerce, Portugal had entered a half-century before this on the pathway of imperialism, and had made conquests on the northwestern coasts of Africa. The Pope now divided all the new world outside of Europe between the Spaniards and the Portuguese, and the Portuguese began to build up their empire in Brazil, in the East Indies, and on the ocean isles.

Their conquest of the natives of India was marked by brutal cruelty and exploitation, and the whole story of Portuguese imperialism is marred by disregard for human life and the exaltation of materialistic love of gain. For nearly a hundred years, they monopolized the trade with India, until it was wrested from them by the Dutch and English. They grew rich on this, but wasted their great wealth and small population upon incessant wars in the East and in Africa, until Spain took advantage of their

¹ Thus America might have been discovered without Columbus!

weakness and once more annexed their country and its conquests as a Spanish province (1581).

For sixty years, Portugal shared again the dark and bloody history of Spain, and many rival princes (five at one time) fought to win from one another and from Spain the crown of Portugal. One of these was finally enabled (1640) to unite the Portuguese and, by the decline of Spain's power in her wars with the Netherlands and other countries, to reëstablish Portugal's independence.

The restored kingdom endeavoured to steer clear of the wars which raged through the rest of the Seventeenth Century between her big neighbours, Spain, France and England. But by giving to the English king, Charles II, a Portuguese princess in marriage and also Bombay, the first spot in India obtained by the English crown, and by receiving the right of exporting "port" wine to English consumers, Portugal became a kind of ally or protégée of England and her navy, and has followed many of England's foreign fortunes ever since.

When Louis XIV of France endeavoured to secure the crown of Spain for his grandson, Portugal joined with England and her allies against France in the terrible and costly War of the Spanish Succession. Extravagant and dishonest administrations followed; the Earthquake of 1755 destroyed Lisbon, the Portuguese capital, and more than 30,000 lives; thus weakened by war and woe, Portugal was henceforth practically the financial and political satellite of England.

When Portugal, at England's bidding, refused Napoleon's embargo upon trade to and from England, and when Napoleon sent a French army into Portugal to enforce his commands, the English sent their armies under Wellington to Portugal's aid. There ensued the Peninsular War (1808-14), in which Portugal as well as Spain was the scene of a titanic conflict between French and English armies, and Portugal itself suffered terrible loss of life and property. The royal family and many public officials fled to the Portuguese colony of Brazil, and Portugal was ruled

by first a French and then an English commander-in-chief, becoming little more than a military barracks, battle-ground and base of warlike operations.

At the general peace made after Napoleon's fall, Portugal was repaid for her losses by the doubtful privilege of having her former rulers restored. But these were hardly back upon the throne, before a civil war broke out between two of the princely brothers for possession of it. For more than a dozen years this war lasted (1820-1834), and was marked by an unusual number of barbarities. The elder brother finally won out, and then divided the Portuguese realm by appointing his daughter to rule over Portugal and his son to rule over Brazil.

But not so much a monarchy as a corrupt military oligarchy ruled over Portugal throughout the Nineteenth Century. Finally, the peasants could endure their burdens no longer, and started an insurrection (1903) which resulted in a five years' civil war, the assassination of the king and crown prince, the speedy exile of the new king, and the establishment of a republic (1910). /

The lands which Portugal had conquered in Africa, in Asia, and in Brazil, in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, had always been a millstone around her neck. Brazil fortunately became independent (in 1822); and the Dutch and English took over most of her possessions in Asia. But vast tracts of wild lands and many millions of wild people are still ruled by her in Africa. Although these have been a continual expense to her, her military rulers have insisted upon retaining them under her flag. In the years before the World War, her rulers were equally fearful of England and Germany annexing Portuguese Africa to their own neighbouring possessions.

Following the precedent of two centuries, Portugal fought in the World War on England's side against Germany; and as a reward, about 400 square miles more of land have been added to Portugal's already vast dominions in Africa. Her losses during the war are estimated at 10,000 killed and

disabled, and 12,000 otherwise wounded. This was a severe loss of youthful males in a total population of less than 6,000,000; but a more serious and an annually recurring loss to Portugal is her "principal export," namely, oppressed peasants, 60,000 of whom emigrate each year to Brazil and other favoured lands. Such is the natural result of a policy, centuries old, of conquest, imperialism and military "preparedness." No country on earth could profit more by a substitution of the peace-method for the war-method which for so long has sapped her strength and energies.

Italy

The Italian peninsula was occupied in prehistoric times by various peoples who were conquered by the Italian tribes invading the country from the north and east. Among these prehistoric peoples were the Etrurians and the Greeks, who lived in Northern and Southern Italy, respectively, and who helped greatly to civilize in various ways the barbarous Italian invaders.

Among the Italians, the Romans became predominant, and the history of Italy for twelve hundred years (753 B. C. to 476 A. D.) is the history of the Roman Kingdom, Republic and Empire. The wars in which the Italian peoples were forced by their Roman rulers to participate, during these twelve centuries, have already been outlined under the history of Ancient Rome.¹

During the decline and fall of the Western Roman Empire, Italy suffered the fate of all the provinces at the hands of the barbarians. The West Goths, the Vandals, the Huns, the East Goths and the Lombards successively invaded Italy, defeated her armies, captured Rome itself on several occasions, plundered her cities, and devastated much of her land. The conquered peoples of Italy had been enfeebled and corrupted by war, misgovernment, idleness, luxuriousness, and various vices; but the forms and ideals of the old civilization made a profound impression upon the simple-

¹ See pages 30-34.

hearted barbarians of the forests and the steppes, and the conquerors were themselves gradually absorbed in and conquered by the Græco-Roman culture.

This process of invasion, settlement and civilization went on in Italy for about four centuries (400 to 800 A. D.), the so-called "Dark Ages," and then another Teutonic people, the Franks, intervened in Italy, destroyed the kingdom of the Teutonic Lombards, and started Rome and Italy on another period of more than a thousand years (800 to 1870 A. D.).

Although Charlemagne and the Franks intervened in the name of the Pope, they did not confer the sovereignty of the land upon him, nor did they succeed in uniting the Italian people. Southern Italy remained for many years under the government of the Eastern Roman Empire, with its capital at Constantinople, and northern and central Italy was nominally ruled by the Frankish king, with his capital at Pavia. In Rome and a strip of land stretching across the peninsula from northeast to southwest, known as the Papal States, the Pope gradually made himself the sovereign.

But under these nominal sovereigns Italy was really ruled by a multitude of feudal princes, dukes, counts and other noblemen, and century after century it drank deep of the bitter draught of feudal warfare and anarchy.

The Saracens invaded Southern Italy and Sicily and put an end to the rule of the Eastern Empire there; but they brought with them a great many of the ideals and achievements of the old civilization of Greece, Egypt and the East, and gave another great stimulus to progress in barbarous Europe. But no sooner had this benevolent process gotten well under way, than another wave of barbarians, the Northmen, swept over Sicily and Southern Italy and for a time again submerged the ancient culture (1015). These Northmen in their turn were gradually absorbed and civilized, and then they and their lands were conquered by the German Emperors (1194). One of these Emperors, Frederick II, made Southern Italy and Sicily the center of his

far-reaching realm and a source of culture for much of Western Europe.

But the Emperors meanwhile had entered on their three centuries of struggle with the Popes. This struggle burst out at various times for various reasons, but its chief cause was the determination of each to secure supreme temporal power. The Popes called to their aid the Northmen in Southern Italy, the French, the Spaniards, and even the German subjects of the Emperors themselves. In the course of the long struggle, civil war raged in Germany; innumerable expeditions were made into Italy by the German Emperors; the cities of Northern Italy, under the leadership of Milan, allied themselves with the Pope and fought at one time a war of nearly thirty years against the Emperor; Milan and other cities were besieged, captured and destroyed; many battles were lost and won by each side; and as usual much life and property were destroyed. The French and the Spaniards fought the Germans, in Southern Italy, and then each other; a massacre ("The Sicilian Vespers," 1282) put an end to all the French invaders in Sicily, and confined them to the Kingdom of Naples, while the Spaniards took the Kingdom of Sicily.

The result of the long struggle, apart from its devastations in Italy, was to weaken both Emperor and Pope, prevent the union of both Germany and Italy (until 1870), nullify the attack of Christendom upon the Mohammedans in the Crusades, and give the Magyars and other outside barbarians an opportunity for long and successful warfare against disunited and warring Europe.

With the French, Germans and Spaniards occupying various portions of Italy, and fighting one another for its possession, and the feudal lords and the Pope striving to exercise their power and engaging in ceaseless civil war, the Italian cities remained the only centers of national life and of industry and progress as well. But these, too, were cursed by civil war,—inter-city war,—and anarchy alternating with tyranny which are so frequently war's results.

With Naples in the hands of the French, Sicily ruled by the Spaniards, and Rome and the Papal States governed by feudal lords in the name of the Popes, Italian history proper during many of the mediæval centuries centered chiefly in the cities of Venice, Genoa, Milan and Florence.

Venice was founded by fugitives fleeing to the islands of the Adriatic from the mainland when the Huns and other barbarians invaded Northeast Italy (about 450 A. D.), and it thrived as a city of refuge during the three centuries of turbulence on the mainland which followed. Fishing led to commerce and the carrying-trade, which received a great impulse from the Crusades (1095 to 1270), and Venice became the mistress of the Adriatic and the chief competitor for the rule of the Mediterranean.

This competition led her into a war with the Eastern Empire, in the so-called Fourth Crusade (1204), and to the capture of Constantinople. But her success over this commercial rival immediately raised up another one, the city of Genoa, and for a century and a quarter these two Italian cities fought each other for naval supremacy in the Mediterranean and for monopoly of the trade with the East. The civil war weakened both contestants, and when the Turks appeared in the Eastern Mediterranean they conquered the Eastern Empire and shut out the Venetians from the Eastern trade.

Along with continuous warfare came oligarchy (which, with despotism, is war's twin daughter); and Venice though nominally a republic was ruled by aristocratic autocrats who suppressed, with terrible engines of espionage and punishment, both conspiracies on the part of other aristocrats and revolts on the part of the people. The military ambition of the Venetian rulers and their attempt to extend their power in Northern Italy brought down upon the city a war with the Pope, who had territorial ambitions in Northern Italy also, and who called to his aid the Germans, French and Spaniards (1508). Venice would probably have gone down before this combination of powerful

foes, had not the Pope grown jealous of his French allies, and entered into another alliance with the Venetians, Germans and Spaniards against them (1511).

Though saved from this danger, the Venetians formed another alliance with the French (1513), and shared in the French defeat. The decline of Venice was further aided by the Portuguese discovery of the "outside" ocean route to the East, while Venice struggled in vain, generation after generation, to reconquer the "inside" Mediterranean route from the Turks. In pursuance of this effort, she joined with Austria in the long contest between that country and the Turks; but the allies were unsuccessful, the Turks kept their hold on the Eastern Mediterranean, and Venice lost most of her former conquests. In the course of the long war, the plague aided in the destruction of human life, and the loss of property included the beautiful Parthenon on the Acropolis of Athens, which was blown up by a Venetian bomb.

When the French Revolution came, the Venetian people hoped to get rid of their oligarchy and establish a democracy; but Napoleon and a French army first handed over to Austria most of the mainland possessions of Venice, and then conquered Venice herself and handed it too over to Austria. On Napoleon's fall, the "great powers" of Europe confirmed Austria in her possession of Venice and other Italian cities. In the Revolution of 1848, which swept over Western Europe in opposition to despotism, the Venetians rebelled against Austria, but were ruthlessly suppressed. Again, a dozen years later, when France aided the rest of Northern Italy in its sanguinary war with Austria to throw off the Austrian yoke, the Venetians were still left under Austrian power. But a half-dozen years after this (1866), when Prussia and Austria were at war, the new Kingdom of Italy seized the opportunity of again fighting Austria and acquiring Venice. Although the Italian armies and fleet were defeated by the Austrians, the victories of the Prussians over Austria in this war ensured the cession of Venice and

her territory to Italy, a part of which they have since remained.

Genoa, like Venice, rose to commercial and political power during the Crusades, when her ships participated profitably in the transportation of troops and supplies to and fro across the Mediterranean, and in the lucrative trade which sprang up between Europe and the Levant. A long and desperate war with her neighbour and commercial rival, Pisa, ended in the triumph of Genoa; but a still longer and more bitter war with Venice ended in Genoa's exhaustion and decline.

Falling a prey to the territorial ambition of France, about the time when that illustrious Genoese, Christopher Columbus, was beginning the discovery of a New World, Genoa remained under French rule for a generation and then by a successful revolt secured her independence. But her new freedom did not include self-government, for she immediately fell under the rule of local despots, who succeeded in crushing out successive revolts.

Her powerful neighbours, France, Austria and Savoy coveted the possession of Genoa, and her despots triumphed at home largely because they were constantly called upon to defend her against foreign invasion. Austria seized possession of Sardinia, which Genoa had conquered in the days of her power; and when Corsica, Genoa's other chief island possession, rebelled, the Genoese fought a long and desperate war to suppress the rebellion and then called in the French to aid them,—only to see the French armies stamp out the revolt in blood and flames and then compel Genoa to cede Corsica to France!

A Corsican native, Napoleon Bonaparte, made himself the despotic ruler of his island's conqueror, a generation later, led the French armies into Italy, and annexed Genoa to France. It was thus brought into the Napoleonic cyclone of warfare, and suffered very severely, losing 15,000 of its citizens in a single siege and the famine caused by it. After Napoleon's fall Genoa was handed over to Savoy or the

"Kingdom of Sardinia," which carried it finally into the new Kingdom of Italy.

Milan, the third of the great cities of Northern Italy, had heard the war-drum beat throughout most of its early history. During the struggle between the Emperor and the Pope, it fell into the hands of two families of despots, by the name of Visconti and Sforza, who ruled it throughout most of the Middle Ages. It shared the warlike history of its dukes until their families became extinct, and then it became a bone of contention between France and Germany.

The Pope and Spain, fearing the triumph of the French in Milan and Northern Italy, sent their own troops and hired German mercenaries to battle with the French armies and the Swiss mercenaries who were hired by France. For more than half a century this series of wars lasted, and at the end of them the Duchy of Milan was secured by the Spaniards.

For a century and a half after this, Milan was dragged in the train of the Spanish war-chariot, and when Louis XIV of France attempted to annex Spain and its possessions, Milan and its territory became one of the theaters of the bloody War of the Spanish Succession. At the end of this war, Milan went to Austria. The Austrians held it until Napoleon defeated them in another series of sanguinary battles, and practically annexed it and its neighbouring lands and cities to France under the name of the Cisalpine Republic. Twice more under Napoleon, Milan and its neighbourhood became a theater of terrific wars, and in the midst of them Napoleon converted the so-called Cisalpine Republic into the Kingdom of Italy, with himself as king.

On Napoleon's downfall, Milan and Northern Italy were restored to Austria, against whose tyranny they soon revolted, only to be suppressed by the Austrian troops in terrible street-fighting, after the defeat of Milan's ally, the King of "Sardinia" (or Savoy), on several desperate fields of battle (1848-49). Once more the Milanese revolted and the King of Sardinia and the Emperor of France came to

their aid, and this time the Austrians were finally expelled and Milan and its territory became a part of the new Kingdom of Italy.

Florence was in ancient times a seat of Etruscan civilization; it was conquered by Rome and shared Rome's warlike history. Then during the Middle Ages it became a center of the struggle between the Pope and the Emperor, its citizens being divided into the Papal and the Imperial parties and waging ceaseless civil war with each other. The citizens fought one another over the question of Pope or Emperor, and of democratic or aristocratic rule, first one party and then another being temporarily triumphant. At the end of two centuries of this civil strife, the exhausted citizens succumbed to the benevolent despotism of the family of the Medici,—whose benevolence was swallowed up by despotism and glossed over by titles of "Magnificent."

One of these Florentine despots, in order to save the city from capture by the French, made a treaty of alliance with the French invaders, but was dethroned by his subjects. Strangely enough, when the French were in turn driven from Italy by their rivals, the Pope, the Spaniards and the Germans, the Florentine rulers were restored to power. They were soon afterwards expelled again, and this time they were restored by the French.

The power and title of the Medici expanded from the "Duchy of Florence" to the "Grand Duchy of Tuscany," and for more than three hundred years they ruled over the city and its territory. But gross dissipation, war and "diplomacy," and the increasing hold of the clergy on the superstition of the people, undermined their character and power, and they came to an end in 1737. Florence and Tuscany were then handed over by the "great powers" of Europe to the Duke of Lorraine; and when he became Archduke of Austria they were attached to the fortunes of Austria for more than two centuries (until 1859). Then, in the triumph of "Sardinia" and France over the Austrians, they too became a part of the new Kingdom of Italy,

Florence being its capital for ten years until the acquisition of Rome.

Meanwhile, Florence and Tuscany had been obliged to bear their share of the burden of Austria's wars, and they suffered especially during the Napoleonic cyclone, when they were taken from Austria, given to the Spaniards under the ancient name of the Kingdom of Etruria, annexed to Napoleon's empire under the name of the Kingdom of Italy, and after Napoleon's fall restored to Austria.

Like the waves of the ocean breaking upon the shore, so the tide of war ebbed and flowed over Florence for many centuries; and yet amidst the sand and the wreckage there stand out preëminent above her citizens and her friends and foes, not the names of captains or of kings, but those of Dante, the inspired author, of Savonarola, the religious reformer, and of Galileo, the intrepid man of science.

Naples and Sicily, the fair city and island of Southern Italy, were by no means immune from the rest of Italy's tragic wars. Struggled for in the death-grapple between Rome and Carthage, in the hands of first one and then the other; sharing Rome's centuries of later warfare; conquered in succession by the Saracens, the Normans, the Spaniards, the Austrians, and again by the Spaniards, their attempts at revolts were ruthlessly suppressed, and their people were brutally exploited for the pleasure and profit of their foreign rulers.

After the War of the Spanish Succession (1713), Spain was obliged to relinquish its hold upon Sicily, which was given to the Italian house of Savoy, and upon Naples, which was given to Austria. A few years later (1718), Sicily was seized by the Spaniards, and after their defeat by the "great powers" of Europe, it was taken from Savoy and handed over to Austria; but in the War of the Polish Succession (1733-35) between Russia and Austria on one side, and France, Spain and Savoy on the other, Naples and Sicily were captured from Austria and given back to Spain.

Having been thus handed back and forth among its big

neighbours, the "Kingdom of the Two Sicilies," as Naples and Sicily were called, remained in the hands of the Spaniards until the French Revolution. Naples was conquered by the French in Napoleon's time and converted into the "Parthenopæan Republic." But this was an independent republic in name only, and was soon after taken entire possession of by the French, and Napoleon's brother Joseph was made its king. Sicily was meanwhile seized by the British fleet, but kept out of Napoleon's clutches.

On the fall of Napoleon, Naples and Sicily went back to their Spanish Bourbon kings; but within a few years their people broke into determined rebellion, and were suppressed and re-subjected to their despotic rulers by an Austrian army acting in the name of the "Holy Alliance" of Austria, Russia and Prussia (1821 and 1848).

Finally, in 1860-61, an Italian revolutionist, Garibaldi, led an expedition against the Bourbons in Naples and Sicily, and being joined by the armies of the King of "Sardinia," together they defeated the Spanish, French and Papal troops, and united all of Southern and Central Italy with the new Kingdom of Italy.

Rome, strangely enough, was the last of the great Italian cities to join the new Italian Kingdom. The center of the ancient Roman republic and empire, and the heart of their centuries of warfare, it became the prey of the barbarian invaders until the Frankish barbarians entered into an alliance with the Pope and made it the capital of the Papal States (about 760 A. D.).

These States were increased by gifts of territory from a Countess of Tuscany and other rulers of Italian lands, and became the basis of the Popes' temporal power in their three centuries of struggle with the Emperors of Germany. No sooner was this contest ended before the Pope entered upon another with the King of France. As a result of this contest, the seat of the papacy was removed for seventy years from Rome to the French city of Avignon.

During this period of the so-called "Babylonish Captiv-

ity" of the Popes in France, and on several other occasions, the Roman people attempted to get rid of the papal rule and reëstablish the old Roman Republic. These attempts, under such leaders as Arnold of Brescia and Cola di Rienzi were suppressed after bloody battles by the troops of emperor, pope or nobles.

The nobles of Rome and the rest of the Papal States indulged in all the private warfare, turbulence and despotism characteristic of feudalism, and fought one another, the people and the popes, most of whom were supplied by one or another family of the nobility. The old civilization revived from time to time, especially in the form of architecture, painting and sculpture; but warfare, feudal turbulence and ecclesiastical repression soon checked its progress and promise. At one time (1527), the army of "His Most Catholic Majesty," the King of Spain and Emperor of Germany, in the course of his wars against France and the Pope, captured Rome and probably destroyed more of the relics of the old Roman civilization than even the Goths and Vandals had done.

The foreign invaders of Italy,—Saracens, Greeks, Normans, Germans, Spanish, French and Austrians,—kept the popes as temporal rulers in continual hot water and led them into a long and devious course of diplomacy and war, during which the brunt of the burden was borne as usual by the citizens and peasants.

When Napoleon and the French invaded Italy, the pope purchased peace and immunity from conquest along with the rest of Italy by ceding a large portion of the Papal States to France (1797). But the intrigues of the pope against the French speedily led to the occupation of Rome by French troops, the captivity of Pope Pius VI, and the proclamation of the Roman Republic (1798). To secure the support of French Catholics, however, Napoleon restored the pope to his throne in Rome and to a small part of the Papal States (1802). The pope then refused to make an offensive and defensive alliance with Napoleon

against England, and the French again occupied Rome, and annexed it and the Papal States to France, while the pope was carried off to French prisons (1808-14).

On Napoleon's fall, the pope again returned to Rome, and the Papal States remained under his sovereignty until they were invaded and conquered by Garibaldi and the new King of Italy (1860). During these years of revolt against tyranny in so many parts of Europe, the pope had several opportunities of establishing popular government and even of uniting the Italian people in a confederation under his presidency. But his own timidity, the ambition of the King of "Sardinia," and the intervention of the Austrians, the Spanish and the French, prevented these opportunities from being seized.

When the new Kingdom of Italy was formed (1861), the pope resisted the union of his domain with it, the French and Spanish went to his assistance, and Rome was occupied by a French garrison acting in his name. The War of 1870-71 between France and Prussia necessitated the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome, the Italian troops captured it, and the old republican, imperial, and papal city became the capital of the new kingdom, while the pope, having lost his temporal dominions, was confined to a palace, a castle, a garden and a church.¹

The Dukes of Savoy, who became first Kings of Sardinia, and then Kings of Italy, established their duchy during the Middle Ages in the northwestern part of Italy. They annexed Piedmont to their duchy, and in a series of petty wars made themselves the strongest of the native dynasties. Their greed for land, however, brought them into unsuccessful conflict with their Swiss neighbours; and their attempts to profit by the wars of the Sixteenth Century between France and Germany caused their temporary exile from their duchy.

¹ His tiny domain, The Papal State, has been slightly extended (1929) and its autonomy recognized by treaty with the Italian government (Mussolini).

When France under Louis XIV defied the rest of Europe in the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714), Savoy joined with France's foes, and as a reward for its military aid in defeating the French received the island of Sicily. But, a few years later, Spain having seized Sicily and Sardinia, Savoy was compelled to surrender Sicily and receive Sardinia in its stead, while the Duke of Savoy's injured feelings were soothed by his recognition by the "great powers" as "King of Sardinia."

The other wars of the Eighteenth Century, also, were utilized by the Kings of Sardinia to extend their lands at the expense of their neighbours, especially Milan. When Napoleon began his campaign in Italy against the Austrians (1796), the Sardinian king joined with Austria, which he calculated to be the stronger side; and when his own and the Austrian armies were overwhelmingly defeated by Napoleon, he was obliged to cede Savoy and Nice to France, thus retaining only his island possessions in Sardinia. His continental lands suffered from repeated invasions during the Napoleonic wars; and when Napoleon was overthrown, the "great powers" not only restored them to him, but added Genoa also. Not only did the king come back, but he brought the old absolutist monarchy back with him, and thereby caused his subjects to revolt. The Holy Alliance sent an Austrian army to his aid, the revolt was cruelly suppressed, and despotism was again restored (1821).

When the next revolutionary wave struck Europe, and especially Austria, in 1848, the Sardinian king seized the opportunity by attempting to drive the Austrians out of Northern Italy and to take it for himself. But after a few victories, the Sardinian troops were severely defeated, their king was compelled to abdicate in favour of his son, and the kingdom was probably saved from Austrian domination only by the jealousy of the other European powers, especially France.

On the outbreak of the next war (1854-56), between Russia on one side, and Turkey, France and England on

the other, the King of Sardinia guessed better as to the winning side, and having sent an army of 15,000 men to help the French in the Crimea against Russia, Napoleon III came to his aid in a second war against Austria (1859).

In this war, a series of exceptionally bloody battles were gained by the French and Sardinians against the Austrians, and most of Northern Italy was ceded to the Sardinian king. One of these battles stained the soil near the city of Magenta with so much human blood that "magenta" has been used ever since as the name of a blood-red shade of colour; while another of them, that at Solferino, fought on a blazing day in June, caused such frightful suffering to the wounded on the field of battle that a kind-hearted native of Switzerland started a movement which resulted in the agreement at Geneva for the adoption of the Red Cross rules and Red Cross societies for the alleviation of some of the misery caused by war.

The French, jealous of Sardinia's growing power, withdrew from the war before the Austrians and Spanish were driven completely out of Italy, and France exacted the cession to itself of Savoy and Nice. Nice was the birth-place of Garibaldi, who at once started an insurrection to drive all the foreigners out of Italy. The King of Sardinia supported this insurrection, and the whole peninsula, except Venice, Rome, Savoy and Nice, was conquered and converted into the Kingdom of Italy (1860-61).

The new King of Italy then took his opportunity, in the wars between Prussia and Austria (1866) and between Prussia and France (1870), to add Venice and Rome to his kingdom.

Savoy and Nice remained in the hands of the French, however; and this cause of hostility between the new Italian kingdom and its neighbour, the French Republic, was greatly increased by the French occupation of Algiers and Tunis on the north coast of Africa. These lands were just across the Mediterranean from Italy, and close to her shores, and she had designed to make them the base of an

Italian empire which, it was hoped, would place her on a par with her imperialistic rivals, the "great powers" of Europe. Italy therefore joined in the Triple Alliance with Germany and her own old ruler and oppressor, Austria, as a means of protection and, perhaps, of aggression, against France.

When the World War began, it was for some months a question as to which side Italy would join; but she finally decided to break her alliance with Germany and Austria and fight on the side of France and its allies, hoping thereby to regain from Austria the rest of the lands in the Alps and around the Adriatic Sea which the Italians claimed as their own. The Italian initial successes in the war were reversed, Italy was several times invaded, and was probably saved from conquest only by the necessity which the Austrians and Germans were under of dividing their forces and fighting titanic battles at the same time on the French, Russian and other fronts besides the Italian.

Italy's losses in the World War included more than one million men killed and seriously wounded, and nearly two million more otherwise wounded, captured and missing; while her property loss amounted to 18% of her entire national wealth. With this loss of man-power and of wealth, were added much devastation in the invaded provinces of the northeast, wide unemployment, the rapid growth of socialism and communism and of conservative reaction under the name of "fascism," a lack of fuel for her manufacturing industries, enormously increased indebtedness, and crushing taxation. While added to these internal difficulties, are the fears and jealousies created among other nations by Italy's imperialistic ambitions. These include Albania, Fiume and as much of the Adriatic coast as possible, in Europe, southwestern Anatolia in Asia and the islands off its coast, and as much additional territory as possible in Africa. At home, a military despot has swept away self-government, and is ruling Italy with an iron hand in preparation for the imperialistic adventures of the future.

Thus Italy's past history is not only so filled with wars as to have made it the battle-field of Europe; but, seen through the distorted glamour of "victory" it is urging the Italy of to-day to emulate the far-reaching conquests of mediæval Venice and Genoa, if not of ancient Rome herself. Surely, the future of Italy will be a sad one indeed, unless she too can discard the war-method of the bloody past, and apply consistently the peace-method of the future.

Austria

The River Danube was the northern boundary of the Roman Empire, and Austria's lands bestride that river. Hence the first of Austria's historic wars were fought between the Roman legions and the many barbarous peoples who lived to the north and the south of that river, and who threatened to invade the empire. Before the Romans, and before the Greeks, these dark and bloody lands doubtless knew much of prehistoric warfare.

During the migrations of the Teutonic barbarians and their overthrow of the Western Roman Empire, Austria had her full share of invasion, conquest, settlement, expulsion. When these barbarians were establishing themselves within the empire and gradually absorbing the ancient civilization, they tried to protect themselves against the invasions of new hordes of barbarians, such as the Northmen, Slavs, Avars and Magyars.

To defend his realm against these later invaders, Charlemagne established marks, or border lands, one of which was called the Ostmark, or East Mark, and which grew into Austria (about 950 A. D.). Two centuries later, after almost constant warfare with the invaders, the Margrave of the Ostmark was given the title of Duke of Austria (1156 A. D.).

The wars continued, principally with the Slavs of Bohemia, who finally conquered Austria (1246) and held it in subjection for thirty years. Then Rudolf of Habsburg, the Emperor of Germany, defeated and killed the Bohemian

king, and took Austria and its neighbouring lands as the chief possession of the House of Habsburg (1278).

During the next century and a half, the Habsburg rulers of Austria were struggling to retain or secure the imperial throne of Germany, or "The Holy Roman Empire," as it was called, and were fighting against their rivals, the other German dukes, and against the Bohemians, the Pope, the French and the Swiss. By a series of marriages with heiresses of neighbouring lands, these Austrian archdukes became for a time kings of Bohemia and Hungary and acquired the imperial crown of Germany, which they kept in their family for three centuries and a half (1438-1806).

The annals of these years are filled with wars, civil and foreign, against rivals in Austria and in Germany, and against rival sovereigns outside. An attempt to conquer northern Italy, and the union of Austria with Spain and the Netherlands, brought about a series of six wars between the Habsburg rulers and France, which feared for her existence between the upper and the nether millstones of the Habsburg possessions. These wars occurred in the Sixteenth Century (1521-1556), when the German Protestants were seeking independence of the papacy and fighting with the Austrian rulers and other German Catholic princes. At the same time, the Austrians became engaged in a desperate series of wars with the Turks, which broke out at intervals for more than two hundred and fifty years (1526-1791).

In the Turkish wars, the outlying provinces of Austria were repeatedly conquered and held for varying times, while Vienna itself barely escaped capture in several sieges. The struggle with the German Protestants resulted in the frightfully cruel and bloody Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), which devastated and decimated large parts of Germany and its people, and left them exhausted in poverty and misery for a full century after its close.

The contest between Austria and France resulted in bitter enmity between them, which survived long after their wars in the Sixteenth Century and controlled their foreign policy

for many years. For example, although the French kings were Catholic, and were cruel persecutors of Protestants at home, they intervened in the wars in Germany on behalf of the German Protestants, gave them very substantial aid in the Thirty Years' War, and at the peace which concluded it secured the cession from Austria and the Empire of parts of Alsace and Lorraine and the famous fortress-city of Verdun.

The old hatred broke out again in the next century, when Louis XIV of France endeavoured to acquire, first the Spanish Netherlands, and then Spain itself. Austria took part with the Spaniards and other foes of France in the four wars of aggression which Louis waged (1667-1714). In the last of these, the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-14), the Austrian Prince Eugene shared the "laurels" won by the English Duke of Marlborough in the many "famous victories" which drenched the soil of Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Germany and far-off America with human blood.

At the end of this war, the Austrian ruler was rewarded for the efforts and losses of his people by the cession of the Spanish Netherlands and various parts of northern and southern Italy. This made Austria again a great western European power, and as such it participated in the various alliances and wars which afflicted Europe in the Eighteenth Century. First in alliance with France and England against Spain (1718-20); next in alliance with Russia against France, Spain, and Poland (1733-38); then in alliance with England against Prussia, France, Spain, Bavaria, and Saxony (1740-45); then in alliance with Saxony, England and Holland against Bavaria, France and Prussia (1745-48); next in alliance with Russia, France and Sweden against Prussia and England (1756-63); then in alliance with Bavaria against Prussia and Saxony (1778-79); then against Holland for the opening up of the River Scheldt (1781-85); then an attempt to compel Bavaria's ruler to give Bavaria to Austria in exchange for the Austrian Neth-

erlands, which brought about an alliance of Prussia and most of the German princes against Austria (1783-85); and finally a civil war in the Austrian Netherlands, for the purpose of suppressing a liberal revolt (1789-90).

In all of this war and diplomacy, Austria's prime object was to get all the territory that she could, and to keep all that she got. The net result of it all to Austria was that she lost some of her east European lands to Prussia, but retained her lands in Italy and the Netherlands, and still remained a "great" western European power when the French Revolution burst forth. In confirmation of the old adage that when thieves fall out honest men get their dues, the financial needs of all these wars compelled the Austrian rulers to abolish serfdom and establish religious toleration in their domains.

As a west European power, Austria was immediately involved in the wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon (1792-1815). In alliance with Prussia, it tried to crush the Revolution in its infancy by invading France, and thus caused the Revolutionists to initiate the Reign of Terror for the whipping of all Frenchmen into line against the foreign invaders. Against the French Revolutionists (1792-94), Conservatives (1794-95), and Reactionaries (1795-99), alike, and against Napoleon, their successor, Austria fought desperately on almost all the battle-fields of Europe, and in alliance with almost all the powers of Europe outside of France. Driven permanently out of the Netherlands and temporarily out of Italy and western Germany by French victories, Austria was itself repeatedly invaded and its capital, Vienna, twice fell into the hands of Napoleon (1805 and 1809).

On the downfall of Napoleon, northern Italy was given to Austria and the possession of her share of Poland (which Russia, Austria and Prussia had divided among them during the war) was confirmed. Having lost the Belgian Netherlands and ceased to be a west European power, Austria's ambition from this time was to rival Russia and Prussia

in the east, and to dominate the south and southeast of Europe, with one foot planted on the Italian coasts of the Mediterranean and the other on the Balkan coasts of the Ægean.

The wars which Austria fought during the Nineteenth Century with her Italian subjects, with Sardinia, with France and with Prussia, lost her all of her possessions in Italy. Her championship of despotism, as leader of the Holy Alliance, first brought about a reign of terror and various armed interventions against liberty, and then caused the Revolution of 1848, which swept over all Europe, and compelled the abdication of one Austrian emperor, and almost dethroned the Habsburg dynasty. During this revolution, three bloody insurrections occurred in the streets of Vienna, which were cruelly suppressed by the regular army; and a fierce rebellion broke out in Austria's dependency of Hungary, which was finally stamped out in blood and flames by the allied Austrian and Russian armies.

Austria had been for nearly four centuries the head of the "Holy Roman Empire of the German People" and the leader of the German states; but Prussia had taken advantage of the incessant warfare to assert her claims to leadership, and even to exclude Austria from the German family. A struggle thereupon ensued, the result being Austria's complete defeat and the complete (*temporary*) success of Prussia.

To prevent Prussia from taking the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein from Denmark and annexing them to herself, Austria first fought three wars as Prussia's ally against Denmark, and when Denmark was conquered and the duchies taken from her, the allies quarrelled over who should have them, and Austria and Prussia fought each other in the bloody "Seven Weeks' War" (1866).

In this war, the North German states and Italy sided with Prussia, while the South German states, Saxony and Hanover sided with Austria. Its result was the crushing defeat of Austria, her loss of Venice to Italy, of Schleswig

and Holstein to Prussia, and her exclusion henceforth from the confederation of Germany; while Prussia annexed the two Danish duchies and the kingdom of Hanover, and formed a North German Confederation with herself at the head of it.

Their unsuccessful wars abroad caused the rulers of Austria to diminish their despotism at home; but they still cherished imperialistic ambitions and hoped to extend their power toward the Adriatic and toward Constantinople. When Russia fought Turkey in 1854 and again in 1876, Austria threatened to intervene on the side of Turkey (against whose "barbarism," she had carried on a war of two and a half centuries), and succeeded in securing the privilege of "occupying" the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the promise of leaving them under the suzerainty of Turkey. But when the Young Turk Revolution broke out in Turkey, in 1908, Austria broke her promise and annexed the two provinces. Since these were inhabited largely by Serbians and had long been desired by Serbia, this annexation greatly increased the hatred between Serbia and Austria and was one of the immediate causes of the World War.

Meanwhile, Austria and Prussia having settled their quarrel over the control of Germany entered into a dual alliance (1879), which was soon converted by the entrance of Italy into the Triple Alliance, for the purpose of opposing the hostile designs of Russia and France and of promoting their own plan to control Central and Southeastern Europe.

The two Balkan Wars of 1912-13 increased the extent of Serbian territory and this fact led Austria to fear, both that Serbia would induce the Slavic portions of the Austrian Empire to secede from Austria and unite with Serbia, and also that a stronger Serbia would prevent Austria's expansion toward the Adriatic and Ægean. Hence, when the heir to the Austrian throne was murdered by a Serbian in a Bosnian city, Austria accused the Serbian government of having plotted the murder so that Austria might be thrown

into political confusion and the way be opened for the secession of her Slavic provinces. She accordingly sent to Serbia the famous ultimatum of July 24, 1914, and the World War began.

During the World War, the Austrians taxed their resources to the utmost and engaged in enormously big and expensive expeditions into Russia, Serbia, Roumania, and Italy. With her partner, Germany, supplying the major portion of the joint expeditions, phenomenal military successes were at first achieved. But Austria had never been a national unit,—merely “a geographical expression,” as she was often called,—and centuries of militarism and despotism had made her rotten to the core and prevented much economic progress; so that when the Western Allies and Russia finally brought great pressure to bear upon her in her exhausted condition, she flew to pieces in a violent domestic revolution, and became one of the most striking illustrations in all history of the truth of the saying that “he who taketh the sword shall perish by the sword.”

Nearly a million of her soldiers were slain in the World War, three-quarters of a million were seriously wounded, and two and a half million were otherwise wounded, captured or missing. The loss of her non-combatant men, women and children, due to lack of food, disease and hardships of every kind, has not been closely estimated, but they doubtless supplied, as always in war, the largest number of victims.

Politically, Austria has been reduced to a little more than one-fourth of her former territory and a little more than one-ninth of her former population,—an inland country smaller than Portugal! While around her have been built up larger lands in Italy, Jugo-Slavia, Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia. Almost like little Switzerland she lies, cut off from the sea and surrounded by big neighbours, with one of whom, Germany, she is racially and linguistically allied, and with whom for economic and other reasons she greatly desires to be united.

Economically, her debt is unpayable; her currency is irredeemable; one-third of her people are concentrated in the single city of Vienna; her foodstuffs are insufficient; she has no coal supply for heat, light, transportation or manufacture; her iron-supply is very small, and she must import most of the raw materials for her manufacture.

Uprisings, both for the establishment of communism and the restoration of monarchy, have had to be suppressed since the war; and the republic was soon obliged to declare itself bankrupt and helpless. Fortunately, it was enabled to receive financial aid from foreign capitalists under the auspices of the League of Nations, and is now making a desperate effort to survive.

"How have the mighty fallen" might well be the epitaph over the tomb of the proud old Austria of the Habsburg centuries; and it may reasonably be supposed that the voice of the new Austria will henceforth be heard in favour of substituting the peace-method for the hoary iniquity and futile folly of war.

Hungary

The name of Hungary was left by the Huns to the land which they had occupied for about a century when their kingdom went to pieces in 453 A. D. For centuries before the coming of the Huns, we catch glimpses of migrations into and out of Hungary, on the part of Dacians, Illyrians, Pannonians, Bulgarians, Alans, Avars, Goths, Lombards and Khazars; and we can well suppose that the land and its people had their full share of the warfare of ancient and mediæval times.

The Magyars, who have been for nearly a dozen centuries the dominant people in Hungary, were Finnish nomads who crossed Russia from the Ural regions and gave up their nomadic habits to settle down to an agricultural life in Hungary. While they were still barbarous and heathen, the Carolingian Emperor, Arnulf, made an alliance with them to fight against the Slavs of eastern Europe, who

were threatening to engulf by their vast numbers the Germans and Magyars alike (893).

The Germans were evidently too successful against the Slavs, however, and the Magyars broke their alliance and themselves began a series of terrible invasions and devastations of western Europe (908). They penetrated southern and western Germany to and beyond the Rhine, and into France as far as the Loire, and were gotten rid of only by tribute paid from the royal treasury. Through most of the Tenth Century they continued their raids, suffering several terrible defeats (933, 955, 970); and at times they were received as allies by the various German princes in revolt against their king and emperor.

To prevent this double peril, the German rulers began to intervene in the civil feuds of the Hungarians, and one of them (Henry III) fought three campaigns in behalf of a Hungarian king who was struggling for his throne against domestic and foreign foes. This reliance of the Hungarian kings upon foreign aid caused them to accept civilization and Christianity, and to become the vassals of the German Empire. The feudal lords grew in power, however, and reduced the power of their kings to a minimum. When their native dynasty died out (1308), they chose as their kings, first, princes of the French house of Anjou, then the kings of Bohemia, Austria and Poland; and by these foreign kings they were led into many of the wars of Europe.

While this civil strife and foreign rule were in progress, the Hungarians were at war with the Slavs, the Dalmatians, and the Tatars; the Turks came down upon Hungary and a series of wars started which lasted for more than four centuries (1363-1791). During the first years of the peril, the foreign kings were swept aside and Hungarian leaders temporarily defended and ruled the land (John and Matthias Hunyadi); but the long-continued wars forced the union of Hungary, Bohemia and Austria, from time to time, in the hope of staying the Turkish advance. The tide of war ebbed and flowed across Hungary, which was some-

times ruled by the Turks, sometimes by the Austrians, and even at times in alliance with the Turks against the Austrians (1526-1566, 1682-1699). The land was for long periods divided into three parts and filled with Austrian, Turkish, or native garrisons. The sufferings of the people were correspondingly great, and they were obliged to make bitter complaints that the Austrian garrisons which were supposed to protect them against the Turks did more to devastate the country and starve the people than the Turkish invaders themselves.

With the decline of the Turkish power, the Austrian Habsburgs fixed their clutches firmly upon Hungary and, as far as they were able, imposed their foreign and domestic policy upon it. They introduced into it their determined persecution of the Protestants, who found a refuge in the Transylvanian districts of Hungary. A century and a quarter (1576-1711) of wars, insurrections and executions followed, with both religious and political motives, and with alliances against the Austrians between the Hungarians, the French and the Turks. But Austrian victories over the French and the Turks enabled Austria to crush out all resistance in Hungary, and for a time the ancient kingdom was reduced to a mere province, kept down under military despotism. The ambition of a Habsburg king (Charles VII) to hand on his realms intact to his daughter (Maria Theresa) caused them to relax their iron rule, and the grateful and romantic Hungarians poured out their blood and treasure profusely in support of Maria Theresa against her foes. Again when Austria became involved in the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars (1792-1815), Hungary's assembly of noblemen sent annual subsidies of men and money to take part with Austrians on countless fields of battle. Even an appeal by Napoleon to the Hungarian nobles that they should rise with his aid for national independence, failed to overcome the Habsburg flattery and left them true to Austria and to Austria's essential economic aid.

But after Napoleon's fall, the double tyranny of the Austrian premier, Prince Metternich, and the Hungarian nobles caused the people to demand, first self-government and then independence. Their rulers tried to head off the coming tempest by a series of "moderate reforms," and by the imprisonment and execution of "agitators"; but when the tempest burst all over Europe, in 1848, Metternich and the Austrian rule were swept away and the Hungarian peasants, under their leader, Louis Kossuth, proclaimed the independence of the restored Hungary. Poland, which was struggling at the same time to secure its independence of Russia, sent aid to the Hungarians, while Russia made common cause with Austria and sent its troops to aid the Austrians in the suppression of the rebellion.

In spite of the armies of the two empires which the Hungarians were called upon to oppose, they might have succeeded in their attempt at independence had it not been for their former conquests; the people of Slavonia, Croatia and Transylvania believed the war to be their opportunity to break away from their political union with the Magyars of Hungary, and not only refused to aid them in this hour of their utmost need, but joined actively with the Austrians against them.

Ten or a dozen sanguinary battles were fought, with varying fortune, but finally the rebellion was crushed, Kossuth fled from the country into permanent exile, the other leaders filled the scaffolds and prisons of the victors, the remnants of the Hungarian troops were impressed into the Austrian army, the property of the rebels was confiscated, and the chains of tyranny were again riveted upon the Hungarian people and nobles alike. But upon this débacle, arose the statesmanship born of military defeat. For Austria's many defeats in the wars with Italy and France (1859-60) and with Prussia (1866) made her realize that the policy of blood and iron did not pay either at home or abroad; hence, to prevent another experience like that of 1848, she conceded to Hungary a constitution which gave

to that land complete self-government with an equal share in the Austro-Hungarian Empire (1867).

Unfortunately for both Hungary and Austria, the Slavic parts of the empire were not given equality with the German and Hungarian portions. On the contrary, both Austria and Hungary continued to rule over various Slavic and Italian peoples, and the new Hungarian government, ignoring entirely its own struggle for liberty, was especially severe and domineering in the rule of its subject peoples.

When the World War came, Hungary stood fast by Austria in their joint effort to prevent the secession of their Slavic subjects, and in their joint ambition to increase their power in the Balkans. Like the Austrians, too, the Hungarians reversed their century-old struggle against the Turks, and welcomed them as allies against western Europe.

On the border-land of Russia, Rumania and Serbia, Hungary shared in all the military expeditions, gains and losses of Austria, and together with great loss of life and property in the war, it has suffered great loss of territory and is ringed round by enemies. Its territory and population have been reduced to about one-third of their pre-war size, and it is left only a little larger and more populous than the new Austria. Like Austria, a large part of the population is concentrated in a single city, Budapest, and about two million Magyars have been handed over to neighbouring countries.

During six months of 1919, a determined effort was made to establish communism in Hungary, and this was met by bloody repression, and was followed by several equally determined attempts to restore monarchy in the person of the fallen Habsburg emperor. These attempts also were checked, and the new republic still stands; but it is facing domestic and foreign problems which may well prove its ruin, unless it adheres steadfastly to the sane and efficient methods of peaceful solution.

It is in desperate need of economic treaties with its neighbours, which will enable it to import the raw materials

for its manufacture and to transport and export its surplus agricultural products. But it is hated with a bitter and an age-long hatred by its neighbours, and this hatred is fully reciprocated. Jugo-Slavia, Czecho-Slovakia and Rumania have all acquired lands and populations from Hungary (two millions of the latter being Magyars) and all of them and Austria besides, have boundary quarrels with the new Hungary still pending.

The feeling between Hungary and Rumania is especially bitter. For, not only was Rumania conquered and occupied by Austro-Hungarian armies during the World War, and much of its property "requisitioned"; but after the war, Rumania seized the opportunity of the civil strife in Hungary to invade the land, occupy the capital, rule the people by martial law, and seize and send back to Rumania vast quantities of supplies. This invasion was carried out in defiance of the "great powers" engaged in negotiating the "peace" at Paris, and continued for nearly three months (August to October, 1919). Jugo-Slavia at the same time occupied Hungarian coal mines without authorization; Czecho-Slovakia occupied Hungarian lands before the Peace Conference gave them to her; and Rumania, Jugo-Slavia and Czecho-Slovakia all continued to occupy remaining portions of Hungary for a year and a half after the armistice, and for some time after the peace with Hungary had been signed; their withdrawal even then was effected only under threat and pressure from the Allied Powers of the West.

In view of such incidents and the bitterness engendered by them, it is no wonder that the Balkan lands are still considered one of the most dangerous powder-magazines of Europe, especially since France and Italy are still engaged in the old ominous diplomatic game of creating military alliances and counter-alliances among them. So difficult is it for the Bourbons of the war-method to forget anything or learn anything. May the peace-method be substituted in time to prevent another explosion in the Balkans and another resultant World War!

Germany

Germany is one of the three European lands occupied chiefly by Teutonic peoples, Scandinavia and England being the other two. When the Teutons came to Europe, or indeed whether they came from some place outside at all, is unknown. The curtain of history rises before them about 350 B. C., when a Greek traveller, Pytheas of Marseilles, found some of their tribes living on the shores of the Baltic and told the civilized world about them.

For the thousands of years of their prehistoric period, we can only conjecture their military and all other activities. That they fought their way onward through these centuries, with the aborigines, the Celts, the Slavs and with one another, seems fairly certain. Even after being brought within the ken of history, they came but very seldom into contact with the civilized world. About two hundred and fifty years after the time of Pytheas, a great horde of them left their homes in Denmark and North Germany, migrated with their women and children and herds across Germany and the Alps into northern Italy and southeastern France, overthrew several Roman armies, and were at last mowed down in slaughtered heaps by the legions of Caius Marius (102-101 B. C.).

Cæsar and several of the early Roman emperors invaded Germany, fought several fierce battles with various of its peoples, and sowed dissension and civil war among its tribes; but they failed to conquer it, and gave up the attempt, making the Rhine and Danube the frontier between Rome and German-land. Out of this German-land, as has been seen,¹ came numerous tribes which set up within the Roman empire the temporary kingdoms of the West Goths, East Goths, Lombards, Vandals and Franks.

During their centuries of contact with the Romans before the conquest of the empire, they began to absorb the old civilization; and after the conquest this process went on apace among those Germans who had settled within the

¹ See pages 36-45.

empire. Some of the barbarian leaders, like Theodoric the Ostrogoth and Charles the Frank,—both of whom were called “the great” for this reason,—desired to unite all the Teutonic people under a single government and extend to them Christianity and civilization.

The method of accomplishing this which Charlemagne adopted was the war-method, and he applied it to the Saxons, Lombards and other peoples, filling his reign of nearly a half-century with wars which lasted over intervals of ten and even thirty years. Even Christianity, which should have been a religion of gentleness and peace, he imposed upon the Saxons by military force, driving thousands of them at a time by the edge of the sword into their rivers for baptism into the Christian Church!

Fortunately for the deeper and more permanent results of Christianity and civilization, the Franks united with their war-method one of the methods of peace; for they encouraged Boniface and many another missionary and monk to pursue their activities and form their establishments among the heathen German tribes, to whom they became lighthouses of civilization, true centers of light and leading.

The fierce Saxon wars of Charlemagne's days were accompanied by frequent revolts of the conquered Germans, which were suppressed with much slaughter; and they were followed by the raids of the Northmen and the Slavs, who penetrated far inland from the coasts of Germany and killed, burned and destroyed barbarian and civilized alike.

The terror and peril of the Northmen and Slavic invasions did not prevent the Frankish rulers from quarrelling and fighting over the division of their realm. A civil war among the three grandsons of Charlemagne resulted in the permanent separation of the Frankish people into the Germans on the east and the French on the west, each with their own language and national development (Treaty of Verdun, 843).

One of the grandsons started a “middle kingdom” be-

tween the other two, which he vainly hoped would be permanent and equal with or superior to the others. But his family and their power died out, and the middle kingdom was divided between the Germans and the French (Treaty of Mersen, 870). This treaty was almost immediately broken, however, and there ensued between the French and Germans a struggle for the possession of these lands which has lasted for more than a thousand years, and which became a prime cause of the World War.¹

The New Germany, beginning in 843, was immediately involved in war, not only with the French, but also with "the outside barbarians."

The Northmen continued their devastating raids throughout the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, calling forth many an expedition and battle from the German kings; and although they did not settle largely in Germany as in France, or conquer the kingdom as in England, they kept up the war with the Germans from their kingdom in Denmark until the end of the Eleventh Century.

The Slavs, under the name of Wends, Moravians, Poles and Bohemians, were a terror to the Germans for nearly five centuries after 843. The Germans met their frequent raids on bloody fields of battle, being sometimes defeated and sometimes victorious; and they endeavoured to prevent their raids by paying tribute, by building fortresses and filling them with garrisons, and by creating *marches*, or border-*duchies*, such as those against the Wends and the Magyars, which grew into Prussia and Austria. Fortunately, the fortresses grew into towns, and the townsmen aided by the missionaries and monks carried civilization to the barbarians themselves, who settled down gradually into civilized farmers and artisans and ceased to raid their neighbours' lands.

But the German wars with them continued, those with the Bohemians lasting longest, and ending finally by the

¹ Alsace and Lorraine were parts of the land in this age-long dispute.

Bohemian kings becoming for nearly a century the kings and emperors of Germany (1347-1437). In this latter capacity, their power was sapped by the terribly destructive Hussite Wars (1419-36) which they fought against the so-called "heretics" of Bohemia. In these wars, gunpowder added its destructive force and greatly increased the bloodshed and destruction caused by the old weapons of cavalry and infantry. They gave the last blow to the fortunes of the Bohemian emperors, and their place on the German throne was taken and held by the Habsburgs of Austria from 1437 for nearly four hundred years.

Besides the centuries of warfare with the Northmen and the Slavs, early Germany was involved in a century and a half of warfare with the Magyars of Hungary, whose raids caused enormous loss of life and property both to the raiders and the raided. The Mongols, too, under Batu, the grandson of Jenghis Khan, scorched the eastern border of Germany and defeated a German army on the bloody field of Wahlstatt (1241); but the invading host veered off in their destructive raid to devastate Hungary.

The Crusades against the Mohammedan Turks (1096-1270) were participated in by countless thousands of Germans,—men, women and even children,—most of whom lost their lives by battle, pestilence or famine. The "Plague" or the "Black Death," or the Asiatic Cholera, which made several visitations to Western Europe and carried away perhaps one-third of its population, was one of the indirect results of these expeditions to the Levant. The second, third and fifth Crusades were led in part or whole by German sovereigns, who turned aside temporarily from fighting their fellow-Christians and the Pope in Italy to fight for the Pope against the Mohammedans. And when the Habsburgs came to the throne of Germany, they led the other Germans along with their Austrian subjects into the centuries of warfare with the Turks.

Through all these wars with the "outside barbarians," the Germans were engaged in warfare against the pope and

the Italians, against the French, and in various civil wars within Germany itself.

The struggle with the pope and his allies in Italy began, about 950, and the mediæval part of it lasted for about five centuries (until 1452), when the last German emperor was crowned in Rome. The various dukes and counts of Italy, especially those in the north; the Greeks, the Saracens and the Normans in southern Italy; and the cities and leagues of cities, in several parts of the peninsula, especially in Lombardy, were all involved in the disastrous struggle, together with the pope, the French, and the various German peoples. The destructiveness of these many expeditions, battles, sieges, assaults, revolts and suppressions, and their dire results to the papacy, to the empire, and to Italy, have been elsewhere referred to;¹ but what pen can adequately portray the sufferings of the plain people, the silent multitudes, and the check to human progress, which these generations of senseless warfare caused?

The mediæval series of wars between Germany and France, beginning in 843, raged on from century to century, and centered chiefly about the possession of the lands lying between them. Lorraine, in particular, was conquered first by one side and then by the other; and all this middle district became indeed a "dark and bloody land." At times the German king or emperor interfered in a civil war in France between rivals for the throne; at others, the French king would interfere in Italy, either as an ally of the pope against the emperor, especially when the French tried to establish their own power in southern Italy, or as an ally of the emperor against the pope, when the pope and king of France were involved in ecclesiastical or political quarrels.

More than a hundred years of warfare between the French and the English (1330-1453) brought a temporary truce between the French and the Germans; but when the modern series of wars between France and Germany began,

¹ See page 99.

they had to do again with the possession of the "middle lands" (this time Burgundy and the Netherlands), and with the domination or possession of Italy (1477 and 1494).

Meanwhile, during all these centuries of war abroad, the Germans were involved in almost incessant civil war at home. The great dukes (six of them at first for several centuries) rivalled and fought one another. The emperors fought the dukes; and empire, kingdom, duchies and cities were divided between the parties of the Ghibellines and the Guelfs, who fought general and local wars for or against the emperor. The emperors fought also their rebellious sons and rival kings and emperors, who were set up and aided by foreign foes,—as the dukes were often aided in their wars against the emperors by the "outside barbarians." At one time (1256-73), there was an "inter-regnum" in the empire, and in the absence of the supreme bully all the lesser local bullies engaged in mutual warfare and universal anarchy which they called *Faustrecht*, or Club-Law, or rule by the Iron Fist.

The towns and cities, which somehow managed to grow up in the midst of all this warfare and anarchy, became disgusted with constant attacks by "the robber barons" upon their trade and upon themselves, and they too raised their armies and formed their alliances (the Hanseatic, Suabian, Rhine, and other leagues). These they used in defensive wars against their local oppressors, and finally loaned them to the emperor, whom they came to look upon as the champion of their rights against the nobles and princes. Alas, that they should have gotten rid of King Log only to set up King Stork!

In the midst of all this warfare and anarchy, also, civilization did manage to make some progress; and an event far more important than all the wars put together was the invention by a humble German artisan, John Gutenberg, of the great art of printing (about 1450). This invention among other causes led to the Protestant Revolution; and since the war-method was still the only fashionable one,

this revolution in the realm of learning and religion was accompanied by fierce and sanguinary wars.

The military history of the Protestant Revolution in Germany began with a war of the lesser nobles against the princes, who were acquiring more and more of their local power (1523). The nobles having been suppressed by the princes, the peasants burst into a terrible revolt (1524-25), which was accompanied by frightful atrocities committed on both sides, and was stamped out in blood and flames.¹ And then came immediately the formation of the Catholic and Protestant leagues in preparation for the religious wars.

These wars were moderated in Germany for a century by the necessity which the Catholic rulers of Germany were under of fighting a half-dozen wars with the Catholic French. An uprising of peasants and townspeople under the name of Anabaptists began the religious wars in Germany, and this was stamped out by their princely and ecclesiastical rulers with brutal ruthlessness (1534-35).

This was followed by the Schmalkaldic War, which was fought by the Catholic rulers of Germany against the Protestant princes of Hesse and Saxony, in alliance with France. It smouldered and burst into flame from time to time for a dozen years (1542-55), and was concluded by the so-called "Peace" of Augsburg, which permitted each German prince to enforce whatever religion he pleased upon his subjects.

For a time, the religious dispute was allowed to simmer, Protestantism increasing in some parts of Germany and Catholicism regaining its lost ground in other parts. Intermingled with the religious quarrel, were territorial ambitions cherished by all the German princes and by Germany's neighbours. Out of this seed-bed of strife, there sprang the Thirty Years' War (1618-48), which destroyed

¹ Not until three centuries later, when their masters needed the aid of the peasants against the French invaders, was serfdom abolished in Germany. Germany had learned nothing,—or had entirely misread the lesson,—from the peasant revolts in France and England.

70% of the German people, 80% of their wealth, and most of their towns.

In this war, which was first of all a civil one, the German princes were divided, the Protestant North fighting the Catholic South. To the aid of the Catholics came Catholic Spain; and to the aid of the Protestants came Protestant Denmark and Sweden, and Catholic France. Spain was in pursuit of its old policy of restoring Catholicism and absolutism throughout Western Europe; Denmark and Sweden seized what they considered a good opportunity of extending their lands on the German side of the Baltic, and at one time while helping the German Protestants they were at war with each other; France wanted to secure the rest of Alsace; Bavaria wanted to secure the electoral vote of Bohemia, in electing the German emperor; Saxony wanted Lusatia; Prussia desired Pomerania.

Bohemia was first conquered and punished by Bavaria and the other Catholic powers. Then the Danes, Swedes, French and their German Protestant allies fought battles and sieges all over Germany with the Catholics, and terrible loss of life ensued. Magdeburg and a half-dozen other towns were burned to the ground by a Catholic general, Pappenheim. Wallenstein, another general on the Catholic side, raided and plundered through Saxony and Prussia, until he was assassinated by his Catholic allies, who suspected him of treason; the Protestant Swedes and the Catholic French committed terrible ravages in Bavaria.

After both sides had become nearly exhausted, peace negotiations were begun, but these lingered on for a half-dozen years, while each side was striving to better its position. Finally, the Peace of Westphalia was agreed upon (1648), the chief result of which was to give most of Pomerania to Sweden and some more of Alsace to France, while the German princes retained their former territories and the right to impose their religion upon their own subjects!

The wars between Germany and France, which were

carried on at intervals for more than a century during the wars of religion in Germany (1521-1648), were designed to secure to the German Austrians their claims in the Netherlands and Italy, and to the French their claims in Italy and Spanish Navarre. The French were allied for a time with the Turks, and their joint fleet bombarded and destroyed the Italian city of Nice. The French were also allied with the pope, and at one time (1527), a Catholic German and Spanish army captured Rome and destroyed a large part of the city.

After the Thirty Years' War, the Germans and French again came to blows, this time because of Louis XIV's determination to increase the boundaries of France at the expense of his neighbors. In Louis's four wars of aggression (1667-1714), Germany allied itself with England, Holland and Spain against France; while France again allied itself with the Turks; Sweden first fought on Germany's side, but later joined France against Germany in order to take the rest of Pomerania from Prussia. The wars were fought on land and sea in many parts of the world, Germany becoming the scene of two terrible devastations by French armies in the Palatinate (a fertile, populous district along the Rhine), and of a fierce battle between the Prussians and Swedes at Fehrbellin.

At the various treaties of peace which were made, the sovereigns bargained with one another for coveted lands. Finally (1714), France secured the rest of Alsace and Lorraine; Austria acquired the Spanish Netherlands, and retained its possessions in Italy; while Prussia received recognition of its ruler as a *king*, he having assumed the royal title a dozen years before. For such baubles as these, have countless thousands been made to mourn!

During all these centuries of warfare, "Germany" was not a political reality, but chiefly a geographical expression; for its people had not been politically united since the division of 843. At this time, about 1700, there were more than two hundred secular and ecclesiastical rulers in Ger-

many, very loosely bound together in "The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation," which was politically but little more than a high-sounding name. Hence, with the emergence of Austria as the leader of Catholic and Southern Germany, and of Prussia as the leader of Protestant and Northern Germany, a rivalry set in between them for domination over all the numerous and complicated political units of the common Fatherland.

Austria had been continuously in the German saddle for three centuries, and was far ahead in population and prestige. But the rulers of Prussia decided that the lesson taught by centuries of European history was that the God of Battle *appears* to dispose of affairs here on earth. The second King of Prussia, therefore, set himself the task of building up an invincible army of professional soldiers, numbering more than 80,000 men in a population of two and a half millions. This king's son, Frederick II, utilized the army and the gold which had been left to him for the purpose of weakening Austria and strengthening Prussia.

Taking advantage of a woman sovereign's ascent to the Austrian throne (Maria Theresa), Frederick began a series of three wars, first for the seizure and then for the retention of the Austrian province of Silesia (the three Silesian Wars, 1740-1763). These wars in Germany, like the Thirty Years' War, were again the signal for alliances with, and invasions by, the "great powers" outside of Germany. At first, Prussia was joined by France and Spain, while England, Holland and Hungary fought on the side of Austria; then Prussia and England joined in an alliance against Austria, France, Russia and Sweden.

The fighting lasted continuously for fifteen years, and a thick crowd of battles were fought on land and sea in Europe, America and Asia. In the course of them, Prussia was almost overborne by her ring of foes, who planned to divide her territory among them, reduce her to a third-rate power and put an end to her rivalry with them. But the end of it was that Prussia remained intact and secured

Silesia, her ill-gotten gains from Austria; while her ally, England, gained much territory in America and India, at the expense of France and Spain. But the loss of life, the woe and manifold ills brought to millions of innocent people by this land-grabbing contest among "the powers," have never been, and never can be, adequately recorded or justified.

Twice again in the Eighteenth Century, in 1778-79 and in 1785, the rivalry between Prussia and Austria flared out into war. This was due to Austria's attempt to exchange the Netherlands for Bavaria; but as the plan was resisted not only by Prussia, but also by numerous other German states, it was given up. Five years later, when Austria and Russia defeated the Turks and gained territory from them, Prussia allied itself with the Turks, and another war between Prussia and Austria and Russia was only averted by the rise of the French Revolution, which threatened the thrones of all the despots inside and outside of France.

This cyclonic Revolution and the wars which it brought in its train put a stop for a time to the rivalry between Prussia and Austria within Germany, and united them in a renewal of the century-old strife between Germany and France.

The attempts of the allied Prussian and Austrian armies to conquer France in the early part of the Revolution and restore the Bourbon king of France to power, resulted first in an outburst of revolutionary violence and reign of terror in France itself, in the course of which the moderate constitutional party was overthrown by the revolutionary Girondists, and these were overthrown in turn by the extremists of "the Mountain." Next, the Austro-Prussian invasion was itself repulsed by the French armies, which drove the invaders beyond the Rhine and speedily conquered the Austrian Netherlands and Holland (1792-95).

Prussia's finances were exhausted by this time, and she had quarrelled with Austria over the division of Poland; hence she withdrew from the war for a time and consented

to the acquisition by France of the lands on the left bank of the Rhine. Austria continued the war for two more years, was decisively defeated, and then she too consented to the French acquisition of Germany west of the Rhine (1797).

Prussia stayed out of the second and third coalitions of European powers which struggled in vain against Napoleon (1799-1801, 1805). But Napoleon having become so victorious and, among many other evidences of his power, having occupied half of Germany with French troops, Prussia made an alliance with Russia and again went into the war against him (1806-07). This time the French invaded Prussia, completely defeated its army at Jena and Auerstädt, conquered the entire country and, after decisively defeating the Russian armies, made peace with both countries, under which Prussia ceded nearly one-half of its territories to Napoleon and his allies, paid an indemnity of 140 million francs, cut down its army to 42,000 men, and received a French army of occupation of 150,000.

Out of Germany, also, Napoleon carved the Kingdom of Westphalia for his brother Jerome, and the Kingdom of Saxony and the Confederation of the Rhine, both of which became his allies. He also took away from Prussia all of Poland which it had acquired since 1772, and created out of it a Duchy of Warsaw, in alliance with himself. Austria again tried to cope with Napoleon (1809), was again conquered by him, and was compelled to cede lands inhabited by seven million people.

Hence, when Napoleon was driven out of Russia, after his disastrous invasion of 1812-13, both Prussia and Austria were eager for a war of revenge. They allied themselves with nearly every other country in Europe and engaged in the "War of Liberation," in which Napoleon's armies were defeated in every quarter and driven back into France. The Prussian people, the Spanish people, the people everywhere in Europe rose almost en masse, and even Napoleon's military genius was overwhelmed. After

defeats on many battle-fields, including that at Leipzig, in which alone more than 60,000 men were killed or seriously wounded, he fell finally at Waterloo.

The Prussian army under Blücher shared with the British and the other allies under Wellington the final victory at Waterloo; and both Prussia and Austria shared with England and Russia the settlement of Europe after the great tempest had subsided. A congress of diplomatists was called at Vienna to achieve this settlement; but it was not morally or intellectually equal to its task, and Europe faced another century of wars, some of which were directly caused by the bargains made at the congress itself.

As for Germany, the Rhineland was restored to some of its princes and part of it to Prussia. Prussia also received again its share of Poland and Westphalia, and was given the rest of Pomerania and a large part of Saxony, these being taken from Sweden and Saxony which had been Napoleon's allies. To Austria were restored her former Italian possessions and Venice. The old Holy Roman Empire was not restored, but the number of petty German rulers was greatly reduced and a German Confederation was established, with thirty-nine constituent states, and with Austria holding the presidency.

Sternly ruled by the "Holy Alliance" of Austria, Russia and Prussia, Europe tried to settle back again into the old despotic government and selfish diplomacy which had been disturbed by the French Revolution. But an even greater revolution had set in meanwhile, namely the Industrial Revolution; and this latter revolution, which is still running its course, is destined to make despotism an impossibility and war an anachronism.

The spirit of liberty, which received a great impulse from the Industrial Revolution in all of its aspects, made itself felt in Germany as elsewhere and the old despotism was undermined, and finally overthrown in part by the Revolution of 1848. The popular revolts which had been suppressed and the Revolution of 1848 were accompanied, as

a matter of course, by the shedding of human blood, and were not followed by adequate results.

The method of violence again failed, both to give complete self-government in Germany and to weld the German states into a political union. The constitution granted by the king in Prussia was a very illiberal one; and the attempt to unite Germany under Prussian leadership, with the exclusion of Austria, met not only with Austrian opposition, but also with Prussia's refusal. For the propertied classes in Prussia, the "bourgeoisie," feared that complete self-government would give the labouring classes too much power; and the Prussian government feared that the proposed new Germany would be too democratic, or "revolutionary."

The rulers of Prussia determined, therefore, that a military monarchy should continue to hold sway in Prussia, and that Germany should be united under Prussian leadership, not on the basis of democracy, but on the basis of military power and victories achieved in war. This was the great tragedy of 1848: that the peace-method, this time in the form of democracy and voluntary union, was rejected, and the old discredited war-method was given another trial. The full working-out of this tragedy has perhaps not yet been seen even in the catastrophe of 1914-18.

Prince Bismarck was the Prussian statesman who carried through the policy of "blood and iron"; and his dazzling, temporary success caused him for a half-century to be lauded to the skies, not only by German, but by French, English and American historians, to whom his method seemed the only "practical" one for the achievement of German unity, peace and welfare. Those thoughtful persons, however, who remembered the peaceful and democratic basis of the United States of America, and who believed in the eternal principles of righteousness and in their application to national as well as to individual conduct, denounced Bismarck's method as wrong in itself and hence incapable of complete or enduring success.

The wars fought in pursuance of this policy included three between Prussia and Austria on one side, against Denmark on the other (1848, 1849, 1864); the war between Prussia and North Germany on one side, against Austria, Hanover, Saxony, and South Germany on the other (1866); and the war between all of Germany, except Austria, against France (1870-71).

The result of the first of these was the defeat of Denmark, the small power, by the two big ones, and the acquisition by them of Schleswig and Holstein, over whose possession they immediately began to quarrel.

The Austro-Prussian War was fought out within seven weeks in Bohemia, Hanover and Italy, decided almost by a single gigantic battle (Königgrätz or Sadowa), and resulted in the exclusion (temporary, perhaps) of Austria from the German family, and the formation of the North German Confederation under the domination of Prussia; also in the acquisition by Prussia of Schleswig and Holstein, Hanover and other lands in Western Germany, whereby the Kingdom of Prussia was increased one-quarter in territory and one-quarter in population, and became a formidable neighbour of France in the Rhine-land.

The Franco-Prussian War was caused by the rivalry between the second French Empire under Napoleon III and the Prussian Monarchy under William I for the domination of Europe. Now that Prussia had taken Austria's place at the head of Germany, the old, old rivalry and enmity between the Germans on the one side and the French on the other was transferred from Austria to Prussia; and Bismarck willingly accepted it as the opportunity of welding the German people together in a new and more complete union under Prussia's lead, and on the basis of the military prestige which would come to Prussia as the result of a victory over Germany's ancient foe and rival.

Sounding the slogan that "the Fatherland is again in danger from the French! Let us Germans all rise against the New Napoleon," Prussia was able to rally all Germany,

north and south, to her standard. The war, like that between Prussia and Austria, was swift and the German victory was complete. A series of defeats scattered the French armies in the field, and several successful sieges caused their surrender in fortified towns (Strasbourg, Metz, Sedan, Paris). A revolution broke out in Paris, the second empire was overthrown, the third republic was established, a civil war was fought between the moderates and the radicals, and the German armies occupied Paris and dictated the Treaty of Versailles and the Peace of Frankfort.

Under this so-called "peace," France ceded to Germany Alsace and Lorraine (without their one and a half million inhabitants being consulted), and promised to pay an indemnity of five milliards of francs, a German army to occupy French territory until the indemnity should be paid. The indemnity was paid within two and a half years (September, 1873), and the German troops returned home.

While the treaty was being negotiated at Versailles, the new German Empire was proclaimed in the Hall of Mirrors in the old palace of Germany's conquerors, Louis XIV and Napoleon (January 19, 1871). This military triumph and historic setting was supposed to give a dramatic climax to Bismarck's policy of "blood and iron"; and the blood and suffering of the series of wars which led up to it were supposed to be sufficient to cement the new German union into a permanent one. Economic, linguistic and literary ties and a representative government were not ignored as bonds of union; but they were supposed to be inferior to great military victories, a standing army, universal military training and compulsory military service, in binding the German people together and making them invincible. What a flood of new light has been thrown upon these suppositions by the events of 1918-19, in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, and upon Germany and the world!

For two score years, however, the statesmen of the Bismarck school were praised and emulated by the world. Germany entered upon its turn of "progress and glory."

The industrial revolution converted its people from an agricultural into a great manufacturing and commercial community. Its population grew from forty to seventy millions. It acquired lands in Africa, Asia and the islands of the Pacific, and began to rival the British Empire in colonial and maritime power. Its army outgrew that of France, and it even dreamed of rivalling the navy of Great Britain.

Its difficulties at home with the Catholics, the Socialists, the Democrats, the subject peoples in Poland and Alsace-Lorraine, were temporarily solved or shelved; but abroad it was increasingly feared and hated. Its influence and at times its domination in European diplomacy, especially in opposing the Russian influence in the Balkans and the French and British policy in Turkey and its vassal lands, made itself felt and almost precipitated a general European war on several occasions (1905, 1908, 1911, 1912).

Conscious of its need of aid from outside, Bismarck formed the Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria and Italy (1879 and 1882); and did his best to win Russia also to Germany's side (1887). But Russia could not see with equanimity the Slavic lands in the Balkans, and Constantinople and Russia's route to the Mediterranean, controlled by Germany and Austria. Hence France, isolated, vengeful and anxious in the face of an ever-growing Germany, was able to form the Dual Alliance with Russia (1890). The long-standing British and French rivalry for colonies in Africa was also temporarily settled by an exchange of Egypt for Morocco, and France and Great Britain formed the Entente Cordiale (1904). Then Great Britain and Russia temporarily settled their dispute in Asia over the control of Persia, and Russia's entrance made of the Entente Cordiale a Triple Entente (1907).

Thus Europe was divided into two hostile camps, the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. Added to this ominous fact, and the national hatreds and economic rivalries seething in the various lands, was an unprecedented

rivalry in the increase of armaments on land and sea. This became so burdensome to the tax-payers, so dangerous to the governments, and so provocative of war, that an international conference was held at The Hague in 1899, in an effort to reduce and limit armaments. This conference was participated in by the six "great powers" of Europe, by Japan (which had become Great Britain's ally in 1902), by the United States, and by eighteen smaller powers, all of whose people were eager to check the great and increasing burden of armaments and the danger of war which they entailed.

But the six "great powers" of Europe were so confident that their respective Alliance or Entente was invincible, and asserted so loudly that "the only way to preserve peace is to prepare for war," that this promising attempt to curb the growth of armaments was a failure.

The Hague Conference of 1899 did succeed in agreeing upon mediation, conciliation and arbitration, as peaceful means of settling disputes between nations; and it established an International Court of Arbitration, which succeeded in settling fifteen international disputes before the World War began. But the failure of the Conference to settle the armaments question permitted the growth of armies and navies to go on unchecked. So rapid was their growth, and so great was their menace to the world's peace, that another conference, this time of forty-four governments, was held at The Hague (1907). But, although this conference improved the peaceful means of settling international disputes, it too failed, and for the same reasons as did the first, to solve the problem of armaments. Besides the growth of armies and navies, this problem now involved the invention of big guns, high explosives, poisonous gas, submarines and airships.

The confidence of the two groups of European allies in their superior ability to use these new kinds of warfare caused them to subordinate the peaceful means of settling their disputes, which the Hague Conferences had developed,

and to rely chiefly on military force. Once again the shadow of the sword was permitted to eclipse the scales of justice and peace. It was rattled in its scabbard at each international crisis, in the hope and expectation that its owner could work his will by the threat of using it.

The self-confident and militaristic Kaiser William II was particularly prone to rely upon the threat of armed force to win his points in the game of European diplomacy. At last when Austria threatened Serbia, in July, 1914, and Russia threatened Austria, William came to "stand in shining armour," as he himself phrased it, beside his ally, the Austrian Kaiser, and together they threatened the Russian Czar. France was drawn into the war by her alliance with Russia. Germany, desiring to strike down France before turning on Russia, struck at Paris through little Belgium. Great Britain came to the aid of Belgium and her partners in the Triple Entente, France and Russia. And thus the vicious circle was drawn.

If there had been some means by which the instigators of the resort to arms could have been arrested, tried and sentenced; or if the armaments race had been stopped; and if there had been some means of counteracting the false propaganda which flowed through every country, the war itself might have been prevented. But, like Alpine climbers tied together by the same rope and all pulled down together into the abyss, the armies were tied to the rulers and governments, the people were tied to the armies, and all were drawn on together into the worst war in human history.

The German people followed their leaders throughout the war with a devotion worthy of a better cause. They were the backbone of the struggle on every battle-front; and if it had not been for them, their allies, the Austrians, Turks and Bulgars, would have laid down their arms years before they did, and indeed would not have taken them up. This devotion was based on a belief in the militaristic philosophy of Bismarck, and on the fear (inflamed for many years by the government) of Russia's millions.

A series of stupendous victories made "German efficiency" proverbial for supreme excellence the world around, and appeared to justify the prevalent belief in the supremacy of the mailed fist. In Belgium, France, Italy, Serbia, Roumania, Poland and Russia, the German armies fought gigantic battles and the German eagle screamed his pæon of victory.

But pride in military prowess came before a fall, and what a fall was there! Almost all the world, outside of the four Central European powers, shocked by the atrocities which accompanied the German victories on land and sea, and alarmed by the menace of a victorious militarism, rallied its material and moral forces to roll them against the misguided German people, started revolutions within Bulgaria, Austria and finally Germany itself, and swept the despots from their thrones, the military leaders from the saddle.

The losses to Germany in the World War were, naturally, the greatest of all. Nearly two million German youths were killed; one and three-quarter millions were seriously wounded; three million more were otherwise wounded, captured or missing. The men, women and children back home suffered more death and hardships than the men at the front; for under-nourishment, a high infant mortality and low birth-rate, disease, hunger and despair, stalked through every home in Germany and reaped their victims by the million.

Twenty-two per cent of Germany's entire national wealth was squandered in the destruction of other people's lives and property; and she will be obliged to pay from ten to seventeen per cent more of her entire national wealth by way of reparations.

At the end of the war, a Republic took the place of the old autocratic Empire, and the old militarism was scotched if not killed by industrialism. But a "hunger blockade" of seven or eight months, and a "peace" dictated by the Western Allies, in the same Hall of Mirrors at Versailles

which had witnessed Germany's "glory" a half-century before, completed Germany's misery and despair.

Most of her coal and iron in Silesia, the Saar Valley and Lorraine; 13% of her territory; 12% of her people; her colonial empire in Africa, Asia and the Pacific; her merchant fleet,—were surrendered by Germany to her neighbours, to weaken her and strengthen them. Her most important industrial regions, those of the Rhineland and (for a time) in the valley of the Ruhr, have been occupied by French and Belgian armies of occupation until reparations should be paid, and these have only recently been fixed in amount and the means by which they must be paid agreed upon. Her navy and air-fleet are destroyed, her army is reduced to 100,000 men, and compulsory military training and service are forbidden.

Some of these losses, and notably the last, Germany may well consider gains, and her conquerors would do a benefit to their own people if they would apply the same medicine to themselves. The financial, industrial, political and other social problems within Germany are burning ones for her own people to solve; but her success or failure affects intimately the economic and perhaps the political welfare of the rest of Europe and the world. While some of her external problems affect powerfully and directly the peace of Europe and the world.

The exclusion of five million Germans from their Fatherland, and their inclusion within Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania, Hungary and France, has raised a difficult and dangerous problem as to the protection of national minorities under the new governments. It has made probable also the rise of *German* "Alsace-Lorraines" which in the future may cry out for a war of reconquest and *revanche*.

On every part of Germany's horizon hang dark clouds of bitterness, poverty, revenge, or despair. If these clouds are to be prevented from gathering into another tempest which will bring rack and ruin to Europe and perhaps the world, it is imperative that the old war-methods of military and

economic coercion be discarded, and the new peace-methods of conference and conciliation be applied. It is devoutly to be wished that Germany and all her neighbours will definitely turn their faces toward the new dawn of world justice and realize fully that the portals of future peace and prosperity can *not* be unlocked by the past's blood-rusted key of war and mutual slaughter.

One very important economic peace-method and a half-dozen vital political peace-methods have been applied to dissipate the war-clouds which have been hanging over Europe as a consequence of the World War and the dictated Treaty of Versailles. The economic plight of Germany and her creditors has been greatly alleviated by, the plan of reparation-payments proposed by the so-called Dawes and Young committees. This plan has definitely fixed the times, means and methods of paying reparations by Germany: and it has been of first-rate importance both in helping to restore the economic welfare of Europe, and in preventing another such invasion of Germany by France as occurred in 1923, in the valley of the Ruhr.

The admission of Germany to the League of Nations, in 1926, on equal terms with its other members and with a permanent seat in its Council, gave her a place in the public forum of the world and a voice and vote in determining European affairs, as well as a check upon her own potential predatory policies. Her entrance into the International Court of Justice; her acceptance of that court's optional clause which provides for "compulsory" arbitration of legal dispute with all other nations accepting that clause; her entrance into the Kellogg-Briand Treaty of 1929 for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy, and for the settlement of *all* international disputes by peaceful means *alone*; the reduction of her armaments to the dimensions of a domestic police-force; and the adoption of the Locarno Pacts of 1925, which provide for the inviolability of the Franco-Belgian-German frontiers and the peaceful settlement of all future disputes between these three neigh-

bours: all these progressive measures, as well as the establishment of the new Republic itself, are significant both of the German people's definite turning away from the war-method of the past to the peace-method of the future, and of their prominent leadership in the peace-movement of the present.

France

Before the Celts came to France, we know nothing of its history, and can only conjecture that this invasion, and probably others before it, occasioned much savage warfare among its prehistoric inhabitants. Various Celtic tribes of Belgians, Gauls and Aquitanians settled gradually into a relatively more peaceful life of barbarism, which was disturbed by the civilized and colonizing peoples of the Mediterranean, namely, the Phœnicians, the Greeks and finally the Romans.

The Roman conquest of Gaul, as France was called for many centuries before it received its present name from the Franks, was begun about 125 B. C. and completed three-quarters of a century later by Julius Cæsar. For nearly three centuries before the Romans began their conquest of the Gauls in France, they had suffered invasions from them in Italy, at one time Rome being captured and burned by them (390 B. C.), at another time Hannibal, the Carthaginian, winning their aid against their mutual Roman foe (218-191 B. C.). During the second Carthaginian war, the Romans overwhelmed the Gauls in Northern Italy on several bloody battle-fields, and Gallia Cisalpina, as North Italy was called, was conquered and gradually Romanized.

Gaul beyond the Alps was conquered by Cæsar in a series of campaigns (58-51 B. C.), which were marked by a score of desperate battles on land and water, by siege and capture of the barbarians' towns and strongholds, by wholesale massacre and the annihilation of entire tribes, by the bloody suppression of repeated revolts, and by the military occupation of the subdued and exhausted land. The army of

veterans which Cæsar developed in these Gallic campaigns enabled him to conquer Italy, Rome and the civilized world; hence the Gauls had their revenge in the terrible civil wars of Rome itself and the military autocracy of the empire which followed.

Meanwhile, the Gauls were Romanized, that is, civilized and Christianized, becoming more Roman, it was said, than Rome itself. But the Celts lost their best opportunity of developing their own nationality¹ like their fellow-Aryans, the Greeks, Italians, Slavs and Teutons.

When the turn of the Roman Empire came to perish by the sword which it had worshipped for so many centuries, its provinces in Gaul as elsewhere were overrun by various Teutonic peoples, including the Burgundians, West Goths and Franks, each of whom established a kingdom within the land. The Roman governors and their Celto-Roman subjects resisted the invaders in a half-hearted manner, the weight of taxation and general misgovernment having well-nigh exhausted their resources and crushed their spirit. At one time, they received aid from the Teutonic West Goths, Burgundians and Franks, against the invading Huns, who were defeated under their leader, Attila, near Châlons-sur-Marne (451 A. D.).

After nearly a century of losing warfare and diplomacy, the army of the last Roman governor of Gaul was defeated by the Franks (at Soissons, 486), and Roman rule was replaced by that of the Frankish king Clovis. Further warfare, treachery and gross cruelty enabled Clovis and his successors to conquer the other Teutons in Gaul and Western Germany, namely, the West Goths, the Alamanni, the Thuringians and the Burgundians, and to bring the land under their single rule.

The Frankish kings and their followers accepted Christianity, at least in name, and gradually adopted the civilization of the people whom they had defeated in battle and

¹ Modern France and Spain are very largely Teutonic. Ireland now has a chance to become a genuinely Celtic nation.

among whom they settled. But neither their surface Christianity nor their superficial civilization prevented them from continuing to indulge in deeds of cruel perfidy and in frequent civil war. Finally, a family of successful military commanders (the Carolingians) emerged from this welter of war and confusion, and were able to unite all the Frankish lands and peoples, and some of the other Teutons, under their rule.¹

With the division of the Frankish lands between the grandsons of Charlemagne, in the Treaties of Verdun (843) and Mersen (870), the separate history of France and Germany begins.² With this division begins, also, the thousand years of warfare between the French and German peoples.

But before telling the story of this warfare, we must review that in which the French engaged with other peoples. Surrounded as it is by the ocean, Germany, Italy and Spain, France was not as subject as were these other lands to invasion by the so-called "later barbarians," the Slavs, the Magyars, the Arabs, the Northmen, the Turks, and the Mongols. Of these, only the Magyars, the Arabs and the Northmen invaded French soil; while Germany and Spain during most of the invasions protected France against the Magyars and the Arabs. The Arab, or Moorish, and the Northmen raids into France have been referred to under the story of the Franks;³ and the Magyar raids under that of Germany.⁴

The warfare with the Mohammedan Arabs and Turks was carried from Europe to Western Asia by the Crusaders (1096-1270); and in these two centuries of warfare, the French were the most numerous participants, and usually the leaders. The first Crusade was started at a council held in the French city of Clermont; its two expeditions, both of which suffered very great loss of life, were composed largely of Frenchmen; as its result, the Kingdom of Jerusalem was

¹ See pages 42-44 for the story of the Franks.

² See pages 126-7. ³ See pages 42-44. ⁴ See pages 127-8.

established, ruled and defended during the ninety years of its existence, largely by French noblemen and soldiers.

One of the two royal leaders of the Second Crusade was Louis VII, King of France, and again the French people contributed their thousands to be slain on the bleak coast of Asia Minor; while their king returned home in military failure, and in a quarrel with his queen which led to her divorce and subsequent marriage to the King of England, to the acquisition of large territories in France by the English, and to a century-long war between the two peoples.

In the Third Crusade, another French king, Philip II, sailed with an army to Syria, only to quarrel with Richard I, King of England, and after the loss of a large part of his army to return home before the crusade ended, to fight in Normandy for the reconquest of Richard's lands in France.

The Fourth Crusade was directed, not against the Mohammedan Turks, but against the Eastern Emperor, whose appeal for aid against the Turks had set the crusades in motion! The leaders of this crusade were French barons allied with Flemish and Italian ones, and with the fleet of Venice. After they had besieged, captured and plundered Constantinople, burned a large part of the city, together with many of its priceless treasures of ancient literature and learning, and had caused the murder of the Eastern Emperor, they set up a "Latin" emperor in his place, and gave Athens and other Greek cities to be ruled and exploited by French dukes (1204-61).

The Fifth Crusade was carried on, against the will of the pope, by his German foe, the Emperor Frederick II, who restored temporarily the Kingdom of Jerusalem, but more by reason of wise diplomacy than by war.

The Children's Crusade caused the death of uncounted thousands of French and German children, incited to religious frenzy by their elders, and dying of starvation and disease, or in African slavery.

The last of the crusades (the Sixth and Seventh, 1248-54

and 1270) were led by another King of France, Louis IX, and were supported almost entirely by the French. In the first of these, Louis captured the Egyptian city of Damietta; but when he attacked the Saracen stronghold in Cairo, he was defeated and his entire army was captured. Released from captivity on payment of a heavy ransom, which was exacted from French taxpayers, he returned home in failure, with only a tithe of his army. Sixteen years later, he led another army of Frenchmen, this time to Tunis, where he and the greater part of his men died of the plague.

Twenty years after Louis IX's death (which had earned for him the title of Saint), the last vestige of Christian power was destroyed in Palestine; and among the memories of the Crusaders left to Europe, was that of the French expedition to Tunis, which, repeated seven centuries later, earned for the French the hatred of Italy and brought Italy into the Triple Alliance against them.

The hostile spirit of the Crusades against "the infidel" was not expended solely against the Mohammedans abroad, but burst forth into furious flames of persecution and destruction against the Jew and "the heretic" at home. Throughout Western Europe, the Jews were so fiercely robbed, imprisoned, done to death, and exiled in thousands to the more tolerant East, that they disappeared almost entirely from some lands in the West, to the great loss of those lands in industry, initiative and culture. The history of France is smirched, with those of England, Spain, Belgium and others, by this dark and bloody tragedy; and the French annals include also the terrible story of the "crusade" against the Albigenian "heretics."

The Albigenians, together with the Waldenses and Cathari, were Christian sects who protested by their voice and life against various beliefs and practices of the Church, and were protected in their mountain homes in Southern France and Northwest Italy by Raymond, Count of Toulouse. Just after the Fourth Crusade had accomplished the destruction of the Christian Empire of Constantinople, the

French "soldiers of the Cross" were turned loose against the Christian "heretics" in Southern France. The Albigensians' towns were captured and their inhabitants slaughtered regardless of age and sect, the motto of the captors being, "Slay all, God will know His own!" The County of Toulouse was conquered, a special court, the despicable Inquisition, was established to root out the heresy and destroy the heretics, two revolts were suppressed, and at the end of thirty-seven years of blood and fire (1207-44), it was thought that the sect of heretics was exterminated. But, whatever became of their bodies, their spirits went marching on through the following centuries, and inspired the Huguenots and other Protestants of France, who had to be crushed again in the terrible religious wars of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

Out of the Crusades, also, sprang three militant religious orders, one of which, the Knights of the Temple, is especially connected by its rise and fall with the history of France. Beginning in Jerusalem, in 1118, with a union of nine French knights, who acquired a house on the site of Solomon's Temple, the order grew rapidly in all the Western lands and came to include thousands of members and to possess vast quantities of land and wealth. After the failure of the Crusades, in many of whose battles the Templars inflicted and suffered untold wounds and deaths, they transferred their activities to Western Europe, especially France, and became so menacing to church and state because of their military and political power that the King of France attacked them (1307) and a French pope declared their order dissolved (1312). The French king, like other sovereigns, was envious of the Templars' great wealth, as well as fearful of their power, and confiscated the land and treasure of their order after he had secured their condemnation. Although founded "to free the Holy Sepulchre from the infidel," the order was now convicted, by the free use of hearsay evidence and of torture, of being "heretical, idolatrous and immoral," and its Grand Master, a number

of other high dignitaries, and fifty-four of its members were burned at the stake, behind the Church of St. Antoine in Paris.

The Templars were only one group of knights and noblemen with whom the kings of France waged war during ten centuries (650-1653). The Merovingian kings of the Franks struggled with the commanders of their troops, the Carolingian mayors of the palace, who took their place upon the throne. The Carolingian kings were dominated, confronted by rival kings, conquered in civil war and finally replaced, by the counts and dukes of the House of Hugh Capet. The Capetian kings struggled century after century for their throne and even for their own ducal lands, against the barons to whom the system of Feudalism gave great military and political power. The gradual growth of trade and industry, both by increasing the power of the king and by diminishing that of the barons, was of great benefit to the king in this struggle; for the traders and artisans desired peace from the incessant warfare waged by the barons against one another and against the king, and they desired also the right to live and work and trade together in towns, and to manage the affairs of the towns themselves. Hence they used every opportunity, when their feudal lords were in need of money to carry on war at home and abroad, to purchase for them the right of governing themselves. These rights of local self-government were set down in writing, in so-called charters; but the barons had little respect for their signature and seal, and the townsmen were forced to fight many a battle with their feudal lords in defence of their charters and trade.

In this warfare, the towns and the kings formed alliances against their mutual foe, and the power of the barons was gradually eclipsed by the united and growing power of the kings and cities. Unfortunately for the cities, the kings did not content themselves with the aid supplied them by the cities, but used their growing wealth, collected from both the barons and the people, to hire mercenary troops and build

up a standing army of professional soldiers (1439). With this engine of tyranny, they finally destroyed the power of the barons and established the royal despotism over the cities as well.

The Church had done its best to stop this incessant feudal warfare by proclaiming first the "Peace of God" against all warfare and then, when this failed, the "Truce of God" against all warfare during church festivals and from Wednesday evening to Monday morning in every week, thus leaving only about eighty days in the year available for fighting (1041). But the Middle Ages, like modern times, did not take Christianity seriously as a religion of peace and brotherhood. Hence the Truce of God was a failure, and the wars among the feudal lords and between them and the cities and kings went on and on until feudalism was exhausted and royal despotism took its place.

It is significant that the dying efforts of the feudal lords were put forth against the kings in the time of Richelieu (1641) and Louis XIV (1653), at the very time that these two statesmen were establishing the absolutism of the king over all the people.

At various times in the feudal struggle, the barons had called for foreign aid against their kings, and Germany, England and Spain had responded to their call. Richelieu and Louis XIV now turned the tables and sought to keep the French seigneurs under curb, and to assert the king's absolute rule over all Frenchmen, by fixing their attention and absorbing their efforts in wars against neighbouring nations. The history of many lands reënforces the lesson that foreign war has ever been the prop of domestic tyranny. But before reading of the other foreign wars of France, let us glance at some of the earlier instances of domestic tyranny and revolt.

Against the feudal, the ecclesiastical, and the royal tyranny, the French peasants and townsmen burst into repeated revolts. As early as 997 A. D., when most of the Western world was looking forward to the coming, three

years later, of the Millennium and the reign of the Saints on earth, the peasants rose in arms against their feudal oppressors and the serfdom in which they were bound. Famine and pestilence accompanied the atrocities committed by and against the serfs, who struck out blindly in their poverty, ignorance and despair; and France was very far from enjoying the millennial blessedness which it had so eagerly anticipated.

From time to time during the next three centuries, the peasants attempted to throw off their servile yoke. Their unorganized and feeble, though ferocious, attempts were ruthlessly suppressed; but they formed so continual a menace to their rulers that it was at last decreed (1315) that "according to the law of nature every one should be born free," and that the serfs should therefore be permitted to purchase their freedom from their lords, so that their children might be born free. The subsequent efforts of the peasants to purchase their freedom were gradually successful; but the last vestiges of serfdom did not disappear from France until nearly five centuries later, when the French Revolutionary hurricane swept them away.

Meanwhile, the purchase of freedom was opposed by so much extortion and fraud that the peasants burst into other revolts like those of the Pastoureaux (ca. 1320) and Jacquerie (1358). The former of these revolts was accompanied, as usual, by atrocities on the part of the peasants, and was suppressed by the lords, as usual, with extremes of torture and violence. The spirit of force was shown at the same time by cruel and senseless attacks upon the lepers and the Jews.

The Jacquerie was so-called after the usual nickname of the French peasant, namely, Jacques Bonhomme, and was the most famous and perhaps the most destructive of all the peasants' revolts. The terrible Black Death, or Asiatic Cholera, had recently devastated the rural districts as well as the towns, and the Hundred Years' War with England was under way; so that under the three-fold curse of pesti-

lence, famine and war, the peasants found themselves unable to profit by their newly acquired permission to purchase their freedom, and burst into a truly frightful revolt. More than 100,000 of them roamed through various parts of France, burning, torturing and killing; more than two hundred castles and villas were destroyed. At one town (Meaux), which was captured by or betrayed to a troop of 9,000 of them, they besieged a castle in which three hundred ladies of the nobility had taken refuge; before they captured it, however, the forces of the nobles swept down upon and massacred them, and gave the insurrection its death blow. The rebels everywhere laid down their arms on promise of pardon, but after surrender were treacherously tortured and slain. Though lasting barely three weeks, 20,000 peasants were slain in the insurrection and an unknown, though doubtless much smaller, number of their victims.

At the same time that this revolt was occurring in the rural districts, another serious rebellion was running its course in Paris. The Black Death and the Hundred Years' War had caused great mortality and suffering in the city, and the citizens rose under their leader, Etienne Marcel, the Provost of the Merchants, against the bad government, extravagance and extortions of their rulers. The rebellion lasted for about two years (1357-58), during which the city was in the hands of the rebels, the nobles were persecuted and exploited and some of them slain; but finally the rebel leader was betrayed and assassinated, his chief supporters executed, and the citizens beaten back into submission to their warlords and despots. Fifty years later, another similar uprising occurred in Paris, under the leadership of a butcher, Simonet Caboche; but the "Cabochiens," also, were speedily suppressed by the iron fist, and their grievances left unredressed (1407).

The Hundred Years' War left another evil legacy to France in the form of bands of discharged or deserting soldiers (the *Ecorcheurs*, or Scorchers), who terrorized the

country-side and even Paris by wild deeds of pillage, arson and murder.

This long and terrible foreign war was accompanied, also, by a violent civil war between factions of the French people, known as Armagnacs and Burgundians. They fought and assassinated each other for the possession of the king's person and power, and added greatly to the death and destruction, the poverty and misery of the times.

But even worse than the industrial and political civil warfare, were the civil Wars of Religion, which followed the fierce persecution of individuals and families who accepted Protestantism. These wars were nine in number and lasted almost continuously for thirty-six years (1562-1598), and then broke out again a quarter-century later (1625-28). The Huguenots, as the French Protestants were called, were in a small minority but found an able leader in the Admiral Coligny, and received aid in men and money from England and Holland; while the Catholics had the weak and vicious kings, Charles IX and Henry III, as their nominal leaders, the powerful family of the Guises, in alliance with the Spanish, was the dominant power on the Catholic side.

The skirmishes, battles and sieges in these wars were too numerous to be even mentioned here. They were accompanied by the usual loss of property and of innocent lives, and were intermingled with assassinations,—Coligny, two of the Guises, Henry III, Henry IV, and many of lesser rank falling victims to the assassin's knife. Probably the worst massacre of all occurred at the end of the third war, on St. Bartholomew's Night and Day (August 23-24, 1572), when Coligny and other Huguenot leaders, treacherously invited to attend a princely wedding in Paris, were slain in cold blood, and 3,000 other Huguenots were massacred in Paris, 30,000 victims being the apparent total in France as a whole.

Instead of exterminating the "heretics," as the king and Queen Mother, Catherine d'Medici, desired, this massacre

led to more wars, in which Henry, King of Navarre, became the Huguenots' leader. After suffering numerous minor defeats himself, he seriously defeated the allied Catholic and Spanish army at Arques and Ivry (1589-90), but then abjured the Protestant faith and became a Catholic in order to acquire control of the Catholic city of Paris and undisputed accession to the throne as Henry IV.

Henry did grant religious toleration to the Protestants, however, in the Edict of Nantes (1598); and for some years the Huguenots strove to bear up against the political and other disadvantages they were under. Then they revolted in what might be called the ninth Religious War (1625-28), their stronghold at La Rochelle was captured by Cardinal Richelieu, in spite of the aid received from three English fleets. After this serious blow, the Huguenots were entirely subjugated and became a religious sect, lacking political power and tolerated at the mere will of the king.

When King Louis XIV came to power and then fell under the control of his bigoted mistress, Madame de Maintenon, he revoked the Edict of Nantes and began a fierce persecution of the Huguenots. He sent his horse, foot and dragoons into Languedoc, where many of them had sought places of refuge, compelled the conversion of the faint-hearted to Catholicism, slaughtered thousands who resisted, and enforced the flight of more than 50,000 of their families to other lands. Holland, England and Prussia gladly received these industrious and able exiles and profited greatly from their virtues, while France suffered a corresponding loss from which she has never fully recovered. The war-method, in every form and at home or abroad, is frightfully expensive.

Henry IV, when eight of the Wars of Religion had come to an end, planned a kind of "United States of Europe," which, he hoped, would do away with both civil and foreign war. This "League of Nations" was really intended as an alliance against the Habsburg rulers in Austria and Spain, and as such it would probably have increased, rather than

diminished, the prevalence of European war. Henry was himself on the eve of a war against the Habsburgs when the dagger of a religious fanatic struck him down (1610).

France, like the rest of Europe, was in all too much need of some plan for the prevention of war. For it had been afflicted for centuries with foreign as well as civil war, and it was to endure the curse of war in exaggerated form for centuries to come.

The French wars in Italy had begun in the days when Norman dukes conquered and ruled over Sicily and Southern Italy as Kings of the "Two Sicilies" (1015-1189). This line of French rulers died out; but the sovereigns of France continued to dream of taking their place, and in 1266 one of them sent his brother, Charles of Anjou, who had received the crown of the Two Sicilies from the hands of the pope, with an army of Frenchmen into southern Italy to make good his claim. Charles defeated and killed the rival king, Manfred, brother of the former German Emperor Frederick II, in Italy, and then Frederick II's grandson, Conradin, in Sicily, and for a time ruled in both lands. But the Sicilians soon revolted against their French rulers, and in the so-called "Sicilian Vespers" on Easter Monday, 1282, slaughtered all the French in the island and called in a Spanish prince to protect them against further invasion.

The French continued to rule at Naples over the rest of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and their presence there embittered the contest between Pope Boniface VIII and King Philip IV of France which soon began (1296-1309). In the course of this quarrel, the French seized Rome, arrested the pope and treated him so roughly that he fell ill and died; they then removed the papacy to Avignon, a city in France, where it remained and was controlled by French popes for seventy years (1309-1379).

The last of the Anjou kings of Naples was conquered by the King of Spain, in 1442; but the French kings still cherished their Italian ambitions. A half-century later, Charles VIII of France, partly to assert his Italian claim,

and partly to engage his restless and recently suppressed noblemen in foreign war, invaded and conquered the Kingdom of Naples from the Spanish (1495); but he was almost immediately driven out again by a league composed of the pope, the German emperor, Spain, Venice, and Milan.

The Italians in Naples were not left to rule themselves, however, for Charles' successor, Louis XII, made an alliance with the King of Spain, and their joint armies seized the capital and kingdom (1501). Then the conquerors soon came to blows, the Spaniards triumphed, and the French were again driven out, and gave up their claim to Naples (1504).

Defeated in Southern Italy, the French meanwhile turned their attention to the north, where Louis claimed by inheritance the Duchy of Milan. He defeated and expelled the Italian duke (1500); and, to secure his foothold in Italy, joined in a league with the pope, the German emperor and Spain, against Venice (1508). The French were becoming too powerful, their rivals thought, and the next league was formed against them by the pope, Spain and Venice (1511). In the war which followed, the French and their 5,000 German mercenaries were at first successful; but the Swiss soldiers hired by the pope and the King of Spain defeated the French and compelled them to evacuate Milan. Venice then came to the aid of the French, but the Swiss again defeated them and drove them out of Italy. Meanwhile, the German emperor and the King of England had joined the league against the French, invaded France, and won the "Battle of the Spurs"¹ (1513).

A short truce in all this tricky diplomacy and warfare was soon followed by the attempt of the next French king, Francis I, to make good his Italian claims. He invaded Italy, defeated the Swiss mercenaries in "a brilliant victory," and reconquered Milan (1515). One result of this achievement was a treaty with the Swiss, under which their

¹ So-called either because the French cavalry in their hasty flight dropped many spurs on the field, or because their chief activity was in the use of their spurs instead of their weapons.

troops were to fight henceforth on the side of France; and this treaty lasted two hundred and seventy-five years until the French Revolution swept it away. But the immediate object of Francis I was not achieved; for his victory was speedily followed by four wars with Charles V of Spain and Austria, in the course of which he suffered defeat and captivity, was obliged to ally himself with the Turks and the pope, and lost all the French possessions in Italy.

The successors of Francis I were too busily engaged in the Wars of Religion at home to push the French claims in Italy. But when Spain became involved in the Thirty Years' War, France under Richelieu's lead attacked her in her Italian possessions and succeeded in conquering Savoy (1631); but in the peace which followed, Savoy was relinquished, and again France was left without Italian possessions.

A century later (1730), the French responded to an appeal from Genoa to suppress a rebellion in its island possession of Corsica; and when they had defeated the Corsicans under their leader, Paoli, in a number of fierce and bloody battles, they at last conquered the island and kept it for themselves (1769). A little later in this same year, Napoleon Bonaparte was born in the island. Of Corsican descent, he was born just in time to be of French nativity, and he revenged his mother-land by becoming the military despot of the people who had conquered her.

Italy, as well as France and most of Europe, became the battle-ground for Napoleon's armies; and for some years, nearly all of Italy was annexed to, or dominated by, France. On Napoleon's fall, it reverted to its former sovereigns, most of whom were foreigners, and to its former disunited and oppressed condition. Even the French, whose Revolutions of 1789, 1830 and 1848 had asserted "the rights of man" and given to the Italians the hope of self-government, sided with Italy's despotic rulers in the Revolution of 1848-50 and sent an army to besiege and capture Rome and restore the pope's rule in the Papal States.

A French garrison was left in Rome from 1848 to 1870, and its successful intervention in Italian affairs encouraged the third Napoleon to make an alliance with the King of Sardinia and help him, in several bloody battles, to defeat the Austrians and drive them out of Milan and Northern Italy (1859). Napoleon III, then fearing the undue success of the Sardinians, put a stop to the war before the Austrians and Spaniards had been completely driven out, and compelled the cession of Nice and Savoy by Sardinia to France.

Even after the King of Sardinia had renewed the war and become the King of Italy (1861), the French garrison kept him out of Rome until ten years later, when it was called home to help in the war against Prussia, and at last Rome became the capital of the new Kingdom of Italy which was ruled by Italians only.

The Spaniards were rivals of the French in Italy ever since the Sicilians massacred their French conquerors in 1282 and handed their island over to a Spanish prince. On the death of the last French king of Naples, in 1442, that kingdom also went to a Spanish ruler.

Meanwhile, the French intervened in a civil war in Spain itself, and a French army crossed the Pyrenees, under Bertrand du Guesclin, defeated the Spanish king and expelled him from the country. But the French were then engaged in the Hundred Years' War with the English, who also sent an army into Spain, under Edward, the Black Prince, defeated the French, and restored the Spanish king to his throne (1367).

A hundred years later, the Spaniards, English and Germans intervened in France with the object of preventing the annexation of the Duchy of Brittany to the French throne, but without success (1488). The French king, Charles VIII retaliated by attacking the Spaniards in their Kingdom of Naples, which he rapidly conquered, but was obliged by an alliance of the Spaniards with the pope, the German emperor, Milan and Venice, to surrender it (1495).

The next king, Louis XII, made an alliance with the Spaniards, and together they conquered the Kingdom of Naples, but soon quarrelled over it, and fought each other. The Spanish general, Cordova, defeated the French (at Garigliano, 1504), and they gave up their attempt on Naples.

The Sixteenth Century saw seven wars between France and the Habsburgs of Spain and Austria.¹ In the last of these, England became Spain's ally, the French were defeated (at St. Quentin and at Gravelines), but regained Calais from the English, and acquired a part of Lorraine (1556-59). During the Wars of Religion in France (1562-98), the "Holy League" of the French Catholics made an alliance with Spain, whose king, Philip II not only sent aid to them in their wars against the Huguenots, but also endeavoured to dethrone the Bourbons and acquire the throne of France for himself. A half-century later (1648-53), the King of Spain again intervened in France, this time sending aid to the French nobles (the *Fronde*) who were endeavouring to dethrone the king, or annihilate his power. The Bourbons succeeded in retaining their throne, and a century later retaliated by seizing the Spanish throne for themselves (1701).

During the next War of Religion (The Thirty Years' War, 1618-48), France fought against Spain in Italy, capturing Savoy for a time and the Spanish county of Pignerol permanently; also in Germany, where the Spanish Habsburgs had come to the aid of the Austrians.² The war with Spain lasted until 1659, and when peace was made, France received a large part of Alsace and Lorraine from Germany, and a number of towns in the Spanish Netherlands.

Louis XIV's four wars of aggression (1667-1714) hinged chiefly on the annexation of the Spanish Netherlands to France and the acquisition of the Spanish throne for his grandson. The military success and menace of the French brought England, Holland, Sweden, Prussia, the German

¹ See pages 113-4.

² See pages 131-2.

emperor, Savoy (or Sardinia), and Portugal into the wars against them.

They won numerous bloody victories and suffered more numerous bloody defeats; and although their king was successful in placing his descendants on the throne of Spain and in annexing much of Alsace and Lorraine to France, the French people suffered enormously in loss of life and property, and were reduced for a time to a second-rate power in the councils of Europe. Strange irony of fate, also, a century later they waged a frightful war under Napoleon against all Europe to *depose* the Bourbons from the throne of Spain; and were involved in two more terrific wars against Germany (1870-71 and 1914-18) for the possession of Alsace and Lorraine!

The Bourbons having been placed by France at the cost of so much death and suffering on the throne of Spain, France three years later joined an alliance with England, Holland and Germany to prevent them from annexing Sardinia and Sicily. The allies were successful in this war, and Spain was obliged to surrender Sardinia and Sicily, but France received neither of them, one going to Savoy and the other to Austria (1717-20).

During the next two hundred years, France and Spain were usually in alliance against their common foes, or in pursuit of similar policies. In the War of the Polish Succession (1733-35), they fought together against Austria and Russia. In the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-48), they fought together, in alliance with Prussia, Saxony and Bavaria, against Austria and England. In the Seven Years' War (1756-63), they again fought together, in alliance with Austria and Russia, against England and Prussia. In the American Revolution they allied themselves with the United States and fought against England.

When the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars arrived, the Spanish Bourbons joined the ring of France's foes and did their best to overthrow the revolution and restore the French Bourbons to their throne. Napoleon

retaliated by overthrowing the Spanish Bourbons and placing his brother Joseph on the throne of Spain. The Spanish people resented this exchange; Napoleon found it necessary to conquer them and then to engage in the fierce and bloody Peninsular War against them and their English allies.¹ This war was frightfully costly in human life and treasure, and was one of the chief causes of Napoleon's downfall and the return of the Bourbons to the thrones both of France and Spain.

Eight years later, the French themselves intervened in Spain at the behest of the Holy Alliance and in defence of the Bourbon king against the Spanish people who had risen in demand for self-government. The French army occupied Madrid, captured Cadiz, liberated the king, and enabled the despotic government to engage in a bloody persecution and execution of many leaders of the popular party (1823).

When France itself became a republic, Spain remained a monarchy, and the two governments have been in little sympathy with each other during recent years, for both political and religious reasons. Their rivalry for the occupation of Morocco led them close to war, in 1911, when Spain would probably have joined with Germany if the war had come then. The French did sympathize warmly with the Spanish in their war against the United States, in 1898, but did not succeed in bringing them any European aid. The Spanish republicans and socialists sympathized with France in the recent World War, but the Spanish government maintained its neutrality and refused to go to the aid of its republican neighbour against the imperial Central Powers.

The wars of France with Germany date from the very beginning of their history. No sooner had the treaties of Verdun (843) and Mersen (870) attempted to divide the "Middle Kingdom" of Lotharingia between them, than they began their long struggle for Lorraine and Alsace. Their respective kings granted aid to rebellious dukes and

¹ See pages 90-91.

to rival kings and emperors, seeking thereby to weaken their opponent on the much fought-for borderland. In one great battle, the largest of the Middle Ages (at Bouvines, 1214), one German emperor was allied with England against a rival German emperor allied with France. The French and the rival German emperor won the victory on the field of battle; but this emperor, Frederick II, became so powerful that he dominated all of Europe, including France, for a full generation.

Flanders formed part of the "Middle Kingdom," and the Flemish cities in their effort to secure self-government called upon Germany for aid and fought against their feudal counts who allied themselves with France. At the Battle of Courtrai (1302), the Flemish infantry were victorious over a great army of French cavalrymen, four thousand of whom lost their gilt spurs on the battle-field, which were strewn also with an unknown number of dead artisans and knights. The Germans did not come to the Flemings' aid, however, and the French king exacted from the Flemish count, in return for his unsuccessful aid, the cession of several Flemish towns. Aided by the French, the count defeated his subjects at Cassel (1328); then the English, having started the Hundred Years' War, aided the Flemish against their count (who was again allied with France), and enabled them to win the naval battle of Sluys (1340); but the French king again defeated the Flemings (at Rosebecque, 1382), and when their last duke was slain by the Swiss (1477) annexed Flanders and all of Burgundy to France.

The German emperor, having failed to save Flanders and Burgundy from France, allied himself with England and Spain to prevent the French annexation of the Duchy of Brittany (1488). The French were successful in acquiring Brittany, also; but when they conquered the Kingdom of Naples, they were driven out by an alliance between the German emperor, Spain and the pope (1495).

In the next century came the seven wars between the French kings, Francis I and Henry II, and the Habsburgs

of Germany and Spain (1521-1556).¹ The result of these wars was to enlarge France still more on its German border, bringing to it the cities of Metz, Toul and Verdun, in the Duchy of Lorraine.

The Religious Wars kept the French busy at home for the next half-century; but when they were over and Henry IV desired to steady his uneasy throne by interesting his people in foreign war, he turned again against the German Habsburgs, allied France with Prussia, in the dispute over the Duchy of Cleve, and made great preparations for war in the Rhineland (1610). Henry was assassinated by a French Catholic, in the midst of his warlike preparations; but Prussia secured the coveted possession of Cleve.

The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) supplied another opportunity for the intervention of France in Germany, and under Richelieu's and Mazarin's leadership she accepted the opportunity, allied herself with the Swedes and the German Protestants, and invaded Bavaria. Here the French army was severely defeated (at Duttlingen), but under the new leadership of Turenne and Condé it gained repeated victories over the Bavarians and Austrians, defeating their armies and capturing their cities. The plague, floods and famine added to the horrors of the long and brutal warfare, and peace was finally made (Westphalia, 1648), France receiving a large part of Alsace as her reward for intervention. Spain became involved in this war with France and peace between them was not made until 1659, when France acquired a part of Lorraine and some more towns in Flanders.

In Louis XIV's wars of aggression (1667-1714), France gained more Flemish towns and more lands in the Middle Kingdom; while Austria acquired the Spanish Netherlands and parts of Southern and Northern Italy.

In these wars, some of the Germans (20,000 mercenary soldiers) fought at first on the side of Louis, and Bavaria was for a time allied with France against Austria; but

¹ See pages 88, 113.

Germany as a whole soon joined the Grand Alliance against France and continued for forty years to suffer and inflict much loss of life and property (1674-1714). The Rhine Palatinate was ravaged by Turenne, after he had defeated the Austrian and Prussian armies (1674); and the Palatinate suffered another terrible devastation (1688), when a French army ravaged and burned the whole country as far as Alsace. Meanwhile, in an interval between the wars, French courts of claims had decreed the "reunion" of most of the remaining towns of Alsace with France, and French armies had occupied them, Strasburg included.

The Netherlands and Italy were the chief theater of Louis XIV's last war (1701-14); but Bavaria suffered one gigantic campaign (1703-04), in which "the famous victory" of Blenheim was won by the allied English and Austrians over the allied French and Bavarians.

The Bavarians, with French support, had sought to rival Austria for the leadership of Germany; with the defeat of Bavaria and France, Austria was still at the head of Germany, and still confronted the ancient enemy across the Rhine. The next war, that of the Polish Succession (1733-35), again found Austria, allied with Russia, opposing France, allied with Spain; but it resulted in Austria losing much of its lands in Italy, and France failing to gain more in the Rhineland or to maintain its hold on Poland.

In the three Silesian Wars between Prussia and Austria (1740-1763), France at first seized the opportunity to attack and invade Austria and Bohemia; and when the Austrians and their English allies had won a series of battles against them in Bohemia, Bavaria and Hanover, they made an alliance with Prussia, and defeated the English and Austrians at Fontenoy (1745).

But the rivalry between the English and French over their colonial empires in America and India caused the French to reverse their old, old policy of enmity to Austria and to make an alliance with the Austrians and Russians; while England joined with Prussia. The Third Silesian, or

Seven Years' War, which ensued brought Prussia to the brink of ruin (1756-63); but after continuous and desperate fighting on more than thirty battle-fields in Germany, besides many others in the Old World and the New, and on the ocean, peace was made and all the combatants restored their respective conquests, except that Austria was compelled to cede Silesia to Prussia, and France to cede Canada and India to England.

The old, old enmity between France and Germany was almost paralleled by that between France and England. It began in the Eleventh Century, when William, Duke of Normandy, conquered England and thus became the sovereign King of England as well as a feudal vassal of the King of France (1066). The too powerful duke, with England's as well as Normandy's resources behind him, was from this time a serious menace to the throne and power of the French king.

When William's grandson, Stephen Count of Blois, and his great-grandson, Henry Count of Anjou, ascended the English throne, they united the French provinces of Blois, Maine and Anjou, as well as Normandy, to their English possessions. When Henry of Anjou, who became Henry II, King of England, married the divorced wife of Louis VII of France, and acquired with her the French provinces of Poitou, Guyenne and Gascony, the King of England ruled over more lands and people in France than did the King of France himself.

It was not strange, then, that the French king should utilize every opportunity of weakening the King of England and compelling him to surrender his lands in France. He accordingly sent aid to the rebellious vassals of the Norman and Angevin kings of England when they broke into repeated revolts in France (1077-80, 1090, 1101-06, 1139-53, 1173-5, 1189).

When Richard I of England and Philip II of France went on the Third Crusade (1190), they promptly quarrelled on their arrival in the Holy Land, and Philip returned to

France to intrigue with Richard's brother John against him. On Richard's return, he spent the rest of his life (1194-99) in defending his French possessions against Philip, who promptly turned against John as soon as Richard was dead.

In this war, Philip was victorious, and acquired from John Normandy, Anjou, Maine, Touraine and a part of Aquitaine (1203-4); and when John made an alliance with the German emperor and attempted to regain his French possessions, Philip again defeated him and his German allies (1213-14). On the other hand, when Philip sent an expedition to England to depose John and, after John's death, to place Philip's son Louis on the English throne instead of John's son Henry III, the English barons rallied against the invaders, defeated the French fleet and army, and drove them back home (1216).

Henry III, growing to manhood, preferred the greater refinement of the French, as compared with his English subjects, and the friendship between him and Saint Louis IX of France caused the surrender by Henry of his claims to the lands in Northern France, and by Louis to some of the English lands in Southern France (1260). A few years later, when Henry's barons were in revolt against him, Louis as arbitrator decided the quarrel in favour of Henry (1264).

But this application of the peace-method to the relations between the French and English was not of long duration; for in the next generation the two peoples were again at war (1292-99). Conflicts between French and English fishermen in the Channel began the fighting; and this was followed by the capture and sack of La Rochelle by the English, and the defeat of the English armies in Gascony and Flanders. The pope arbitrated the quarrel between the two kings, giving to France two-thirds of Aquitaine, which was again transferred to England when the English king and his son were betrothed to the French king's sister and daughter.

This application of the peace-method was likewise a failure; for in the next generation began the Hundred Years'

War (1330-1453), which was so disastrous to the prosperity and progress of both nations. The same old quarrel over the lands in France lay at the basis of this long and bloody war, and at several times in its course the English kings claimed the crown of France as well. The French entered into an alliance with Scotland, which gave them a base of operations against England, and which lasted for two centuries and a half; while the English secured as allies the Flemish cities and the Duke of Brittany. The seaport city of Calais was captured by the English and held as a base of operations against France for two hundred years. They besieged and captured Rouen, also, in the course of the war and caused the death of many hundreds of its citizens by starving them within its walls and between its walls and the besieging army. The war was carried into Flanders and Spain, as well as into Northern and Southern France where the English won a number of "famous victories," like Crécy, Poitiers and Agincourt, and captured many fortified towns. But their attempt to fix an alien rule upon French lands and peoples met with the opposition of natural laws, and therefore with failure.

Terribly destructive visitations of the Black Death and civil war in both countries added to the fatalities and miseries of siege and battle. On two occasions, the exhausted combatants made peace, once in 1360 at Bretigny, and once in 1420 at Troyes. The first treaty released the French king John, who had been captured in battle, on payment of a heavy ransom, and recognized the English claim to Southern France, on condition of the English king's renunciation of the throne of France. The second treaty recognized the English king as regent and successor to the throne of France, on condition of his marrying the French king's daughter. Accordingly, when the French king died, his son was put aside, and England's king ascended the throne of France.

This unnatural arrangement, together with the multiplied woes and miseries of France, so wrought on the imagination

of a young peasant girl, Joan of Arc, that she believed herself called by God to deliver her people from the foreign yoke. The French accepted her mission as divine, enthusiastically rallied to the standard which she raised and, taking advantage of the factional struggles and weaknesses of England under its seven-years-old king, they repulsed the English army from Orleans, defeated them in battle, recaptured the towns which they had taken, and finally regained all of France with the exception of the city of Calais.

Joan herself became the victim of jealous intrigues in the French court, was left without support, captured by the Burgundians (who had deserted the French and joined the English), tried at England's behest by a court of French ecclesiastics, condemned as a witch and heretic, and burnt at the stake in the market-place of Rouen (1431). Her influence was even greater after her death than during her life; for both the French and the English came to believe that she was a saint and martyr, instead of a witch and heretic, and this inspired the French with their first genuine ardour of national spirit and correspondingly depressed the English. Unfortunately for France and the world, Joan's career inspired in the French not only the ardour of nationality, but military ardour as well; and her memory and example have been cited through the centuries since as conclusive proof both of the glory and effectiveness of war and of its divine sanction and approval. Thus, doubtless to the utter horror of Joan herself, were she aware of it, there has been developed a Gospel of War, in opposition to the Gospel of Peace which was preached and exemplified by Jesus Christ.

The Hundred Years' War languished on for a score of years after Joan's death; the Burgundians were again united with the French, the English became too absorbed in events at home to supply their troops in France and finally, without any decisive battle, and even without a treaty of peace, the fighting came to an end.

This was in the great year 1453, when the Greek scholars

fleeing before the Turks from Constantinople gave a great impulse to the Revival of Learning and of Civilization in general. The English, instead of making use of the period of peace which followed their long war with France by devoting themselves whole-heartedly to the development of the Renaissance, plunged almost immediately into the ferocious civil Wars of the Roses (1455-85). The victor in this war, Edward IV, sought to unite the English factions in support of his throne by renewing the war against France. He accordingly made an alliance with Burgundy and invaded France; but his diplomacy was no match for that of the wily King Louis XI, who secured peace with Edward and separated him from the Duke of Burgundy. The duke, plunging into his war against the Swiss, was defeated and slain, and Louis thereupon united the duchy with the crown of France (1475-77).

To prevent the Duchy of Brittany from sustaining the same fate, England was soon afterwards allied with Spain and Germany against France; but their efforts proved of no avail, as the French king married the duchess and annexed the duchy (1483). Again, when the French were pushing their claims in Italy, England joined with the pope, the German emperor, and Spain against them; an allied English and German army invaded France and defeated the French army in the "Battle of the Spurs" (1513).

England now became absorbed in the Protestant Revolution, and France entered upon its long series of wars with the Habsburgs; so that the two countries were not again involved in war until England's Queen Mary Tudor married the Spanish Habsburg, Philip II, and led England into his war against France (1557-8). Although the allied English and Spanish army defeated the French army at St. Quentin and Gravelines, the war resulted in the loss by the English of Calais, their last foothold and their old base of operation in France.

On the accession of Mary's sister, Queen Elizabeth, a treaty was made between England and France, under which

France promised not to intervene in the affairs of Scotland, whose queen, Mary Stuart, had married the King of France (1560). But Mary's husband soon died, and she returned to Scotland, where she became the rival of the English queen, and a center of conspiracy against her. Meanwhile, in France, the Religious Wars began; and the English sent aid to the Huguenots, while the French helped the conspiracies against the English queen. England was at the same time aiding the Dutch in their war of independence against Spain; hence, the Spanish war in which England became involved, and France's own civil wars, prevented a very serious war at this time between England and France. When the Huguenots made their last struggle for existence (1625-8), England again sent them aid; but Richelieu was too strong for the allies, the last Huguenot stronghold of La Rochelle was captured in the face of three English fleets, and all chance was lost of building up a strong Protestant power in France friendly to Protestant England.

It is true that when Catholic France was at war with still more Catholic Spain, in 1657, Oliver Cromwell, the Puritan dictator of England, sent 8,000 of his Puritan troops to the assistance of France. But Cromwell soon died, France soon made peace with Spain, and England and France had already entered upon that rivalry in imperialism in the New World which caused them to fight another Hundred Years' War (1637-1763).

Louis XIV's plans for conquest included not only Western Europe but also a greater New France in North America; hence the struggle between France and England in the Old World, in Louis' wars of aggression, had always a parallel or reflexion in the New.

A triple alliance between England, Holland and Sweden put an end to his first war against Spain in the Netherlands (1667-8). Louis' secret treaty with the Catholic Charles II and his payments to that sovereign, together with England's commercial rivalry with the Dutch, kept England out of his next war against Holland (1672-78).

The third war, which was known in America as King William's War (1689-97), was directed chiefly against the Grand Alliance of England, Holland, Germany, Sweden, and Spain, which William of Orange, ruler of both England and Holland, had formed against Louis. The theaters of this war were in the Netherlands, Italy, Ireland, America and on the ocean. Louis hoped to drive William III from the throne of England and replace his Catholic ally, James II, upon it. But, as in the English attempt upon the French throne in the first Hundred Years' War, the forces of nationality were too strong for Louis, and William retained the throne.

William just before his death formed another Grand Alliance of England, Holland, and Germany to oppose Louis XIV in his fourth war of aggression, waged for the purpose of placing his grandson on the throne of Spain (1701-14). This War of the Spanish Succession, or Queen Anne's War, as it was called in America, was led by Marlborough of England and Eugene of Austria, who achieved numerous victories against the French in Bavaria, the Netherlands and Italy. The allies were repulsed when they invaded France, and throughout the war suffered almost as great loss of life as did the French, in the single battle of Malplaquet losing 20,000 men. France suffered enormous economic loss, however, and the miseries endured by her people in the last few years of the war have seldom been surpassed.

Peace having been made and Louis' grandson left upon the throne of Spain, England and France found themselves in temporary alliance with Germany and Holland to oppose Spain's attempt to acquire its former possessions in Italy (1717-8).

But the old enmity broke out into another war (War of the Austrian Succession, or King George's War, as it was called in America), when France in alliance with Spain, Prussia and Bavaria attacked Austria, and England went to Austria's aid (1742-8).

This war saw numerous battles in Europe and America;

but it was entirely eclipsed by the terrible Seven Years' War, or French and Indian War, as it was called in America (1756-63). The fighting began in America between the English and French, and George II made an alliance with Frederick II of Prussia to protect the English king's principality of Hanover, while the English conquered the French possessions in both America and India. In Europe, the battles were fought chiefly by the French, Austrian and Russian armies against the Prussian, which last were supported by British gold. In America and India, the French and English armies fought each other in almost as many battles as raged in Europe. England was completely victorious over the French, and added the French empire beyond the seas to its own. But its victories contained the seeds of defeat; for no sooner was the fear of the French and their Indian allies removed from the hearts of the English colonists in America, than they began their revolution against the mother country. In the American Revolution, the French saw and seized their opportunity to strike back at England by aiding the English colonists to secure their independence. A French army and fleet were sent to take part in the war in America; while France called the Spaniards to aid in attacking the English on the ocean and in the West Indies and India.

The Americans secured their independence, and England thus lost the fairest jewel of her imperial crown; but English fleets and armies defeated the French and Spanish on the ocean, at Gibraltar and in India, and France was unable to regain her lost empire.

When the French Revolution began, France speedily found itself involved in war with all its neighbours, England becoming the most persistent, successful and relentless foe of the revolution and of Napoleon's aggressive warfare that followed it. For almost a quarter-century, this wholesale and sanguinary warfare raged, in many parts of the world and within France itself (1792-1815).

A political and social as well as a religious revolution, and

developing almost immediately into a resort to military violence, the great French Revolution of 1789-95 brought the most intense bitterness of feeling, vast loss of life and treasure, and manifold and multiplied miseries, to all connected with it both at home and abroad.

As in the days of the Pastoureaux and Jacquerie,¹ the peasants rose in revolt against the feudal exactions of their lords, and burned their castles, killed the noble families, and caused great destruction of property in the South and East of France (1789). The citizens of Paris, too, as in the days of the Black Death and the Hundred Years' War,² revolted against the city and national government, seized and destroyed the fortress of the Bastille (an engine of royal tyranny, and of military control of Paris as well), beheaded the king, overthrew the monarchy, and established a republic (1789-92). This revolt, too, was naturally accompanied by much shedding of blood,—that of the soldiers (including the Swiss guards of the Tuileries palace) and of the citizens, combatant and non-combatant.

Meanwhile, the Austrian and Prussian sovereigns fearing for their thrones had declared war against the revolutionists, invaded France, and defeated three French armies in the field. This was the signal for the Reign of Terror to begin in Paris with the arrest of all those suspected of opposing the revolution and with a five days' massacre of hundreds of them.

These September Massacres (1792), the execution of the king, and the attacks of the revolutionists on the property and privileges of the nobility and clergy, caused a violent civil war to burst out in several of the provinces and to rage during the critical months when the foreign invaders were threatening Paris (1792-95). The Vendée, as the civil war was called, was finally crushed by the revolutionists, who took fearful vengeance on the rebels, guillotining and drowning them by the wholesale in various cities of the provinces.

¹ See pages 155-6.

² See page 156.

Meanwhile, the Prussians had captured Verdun and Mainz, the Austrians had continued their invasion of Eastern France, and England, Holland and Spain had joined in the war against the revolutionists. In face of this double war,—foreign and civil,—the whole male population of France capable of bearing arms was drafted, and fourteen armies were placed in the field. And then ensued a war such as Europe had never seen before.

First, the rebel cities of Caen, Bordeaux, Marseilles and Lyons were captured, the last of these being partially destroyed and its inhabitants massacred *en masse*. The rebel armies were defeated in several battles, a revolutionary tribunal was established at the rebel headquarters in Nantes, and 15,000 persons were put to death within three months by its decrees, while the guillotine set up on the Place de la Revolution in Paris put an end to open opposition to the Republic by numerous executions.

Having crushed the civil war, the revolutionary armies turned upon the foreign invaders, drove them across the Rhine, recaptured the seaport of Toulon from the English fleet, defeated the emigrant nobility who flocked back into France with English and Austrian aid to help the Vendéans, conquered the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium) and Holland, annexed Flanders and the west bank of the Rhine to France, and set up a republic in Holland.

In spite of their military victories over the foreign invaders of France, the excesses of the revolutionists at home had been such as to cause a violent reaction against lawlessness. The moderates came back into power, executed over a hundred of the radical leaders, and in their turn began a series of wholesale executions of the radical rank and file (The "White Terror," 1795). Their own resort to militaristic violence led in turn to their downfall and the rise of a successful military leader, Napoleon Bonaparte, to rule with despotic power over all classes alike.

Napoleon's career of triumph began with an invasion of Italy (1796-7), in which he first defeated the King of

Sardinia in two battles and compelled him to cede Savoy and Nice to France. He then defeated the Austrians in a series of battles and sieges and drove them out of Northern Italy, and conquered the Venetians and the Grecian islands which they still held. As the result of these victories, the Austrian Netherlands were ceded to France, the ancient republic of Venice was handed over to Austria, and the Cisalpine, Ligurian, Roman, Parthenopæan and Helvetican republics were established in Italy and Switzerland, all of which were subordinate to France.

Napoleon next invaded Egypt, captured Alexandria and Cairo, defeated the army of the Mamelukes, and conquered the country from Turkey (1798-99). Hoping to use Egypt as a base of operations either against the Turkish capital of Constantinople, or against the British in India, he then advanced into Syria. But the British fleet under Nelson destroyed the French one which had brought Napoleon's expedition to Egypt (Battle of the Nile, or Aboukir, 1798), and defended the Syrian seaport of Acre against Napoleon's attack. Fearing to march further, with the British in his rear, Napoleon returned to Egypt, after having captured Jaffa (and massacred there 1,200 prisoners), defeated the Turks at Mt. Tabor, and again at Aboukir, and suffered a severe loss from the plague. The burning sands of the desert checked him as effectually as did later Russia's snow.

Meanwhile, another coalition of the great powers, England, Russia, Austria and Turkey, was formed against France, and the armies of France were defeated in Switzerland and Italy, many thousands of soldiers dying in the Alpine mountains, and the French republics in Italy being overturned.

On receipt of this news, Napoleon returned to France, leaving Egypt to be reconquered by the British and Turks, and the French soldiers to be brought home in exchange on a British fleet. Using his soldiers to overthrow the French Republic and to establish his own military rule, Napoleon assumed the titles, first of Consul and then of Emperor,

and proceeded to establish his empire on the basis of military triumphs.

He again invaded Italy, defeated the Austrians at Marengo (1800) and reëstablished the French control of Italy. He then turned against England and occupied Hanover, the hereditary possession of the English kings, while preparing a great expedition for the invasion of England itself (1803). Russia and Austria again joined with England, and the War of the Third Coalition began. The British fleet, again under Nelson, outmaneuvered the allied French and Spanish fleet and gained the naval victory of Trafalgar (1805), which prevented Napoleon from invading England. Turning his army of 200,000 men, which he had intended for England, against the Austrians and Russians, Napoleon defeated them at Ulm and at Austerlitz (1805).

As the result of this victory, Napoleon acquired the Venetian territory from Austria, and became King of Italy, making his brother Joseph King of Naples; he converted the Batavian Republic into the Kingdom of Holland, placing his brother Louis upon its throne; and he created in Germany, as rivals to Austria and Prussia, the Kingdoms of Bavaria and Würtemberg and the Confederation of the Rhine (all three dependent on France).

Much of Germany having been acquired by France, and half of it garrisoned by French troops, the Austrian ruler abdicated the throne of the old German, or "Holy Roman," Empire, and became merely the Emperor of Austria; while Prussia, having been first promised and then deprived of Hanover, made an alliance with Russia and renewed the war. The Prussian army which Frederick II had used against the French and his other foes, a half-century before, was again relied upon to achieve Prussian victories; but it crumbled to dust on the battle-field of Jena and Auerstädt, and Napoleon conquered Prussia and filled its fortresses with 150,000 French soldiers (1806-7).

Marching on against the Russians, Napoleon summoned

Poland to revolt, allied himself with Saxony, whose ruler was made a king, fought several bloody battles with the Russians and Prussians, nearly suffered defeat at Eylau, but won a decisive victory at Friedland (1807). At the Peace of Tilsit which followed, Prussia's territory was reduced by nearly 50% and her army to 42,000; and, as two more rivals to her and Austria in Germany, Napoleon increased the territory of the new Kingdom of Saxony by annexing to it parts of Prussia and Poland, and created the Kingdom of Westphalia in Western Germany, placing his brother Jerome upon its throne.

England alone continuing to resist Napoleon, he proclaimed against it his "Continental System," which forbade the continent of Europe to engage in commerce with England. To enforce this policy, or using it as a pretext, he next sent his armies to conquer Portugal and Spain. On the Spanish throne he placed his brother Joseph, giving the throne of Naples to his brother-in-law, Murat. The Spanish people objected to exchanging their Bourbon rulers for the Bonapartes and to being practically annexed to France, and rose in wide-spread revolt. To their aid came British fleets and armies under the command of the Duke of Wellington, and the long and bloody "Peninsular War" ensued (1808-14).

Napoleon's generals with their army of 100,000 men were driven out of Portugal and defeated in Spain, and he came himself with an army of 250,000 and drove the British back into Portugal. But Austria seized the opportunity of the war in Spain to summon the German people to rise, as the Spaniards were doing, against the French, and Napoleon hastened back to attack Austria. He defeated the Austrian army in a series of minor battles and, after one bloody repulse by Archduke Charles at Aspern and Essling, defeated his army again at the terrific battle of Wagram, and once more compelled Austria to yield (1809).

The Austrian Tyrolese, who had begun the revolt against

Napoleon, were also ruthlessly suppressed, and in the Peace of Vienna which followed, Southern Tyrol was added to Napoleon's Kingdom of Italy, while Austria was compelled to cede to Napoleon and his Saxon and Bavarian allies a territory containing 32,000 square miles and three and a half million inhabitants. An attempt made at the same time to call the German people to arms against the French conquerors was suppressed, its leader (Schill) was killed, eleven of his officers were executed, and his six hundred soldiers were carried to France at Napoleon's order, imprisoned as galley-slaves for six months, and then enrolled among the French coast-guards.

Meanwhile, the war in Portugal and Spain was being fiercely waged, the French and British armies and the Spanish guerillas all winning victories and suffering defeats, which caused a great loss of life and immense suffering to the people, but reached no conclusion. Then came another war between Russia, allied with Sweden, and France allied with Prussia and Austria (1812). These two German states were obliged to send 50,000 men to Napoleon's army, which included Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Dutch, Swiss and Poles, to the number of 553,000.

With this great army, Napoleon advanced through Poland, which he did *not* restore to national independence, stormed and destroyed the Russian city of Smolensk, defeated the Russian army in the bloody battle of Borodino (80,000 men lost), and pushed on to Moscow. He reached this city in mid-September, and proposed to make it the winter-quarters of his army during the severe Russian winter which was rapidly approaching. But the Russians, to deprive him of it and compel his retreat, burned the city to the ground. The French soldiers completed its sack and ruin, and then began their disastrous retreat, followed by the Russian army and constantly harassed by Cossack cavalry. After fighting four desperate battles, forcing their way across the Berezina River, and contending with all the rigours of a Russian winter and a dearth of food and water, the rem-

nants of the great army finally escaped into Germany (December 18). The cost in human life of this utterly futile expedition was at least 300,000 young men on the side of the French and their allies, and 100,000 more were taken prisoner; while the Russians probably lost about half as many.

Napoleon had left his army before its escape from Russia, and hurried back to Paris, where he was called upon to prepare immediately for the "War of Liberation" which now confronted him. England, Russia and Sweden made an alliance against France, the German and Austrian people imitated the Spanish and rose *en masse* against the French invaders, and a series of at least seventeen terrific battles began, in one of which (at Leipzig, Oct. 16, 18 and 19, 1813) Napoleon lost 30,000 men.

Driven completely out of Germany, Holland and Spain, the French were now on the defensive, and the year 1814 saw another series of at least twelve desperate battles, in which Napoleon tried to beat off the armies of all Europe converging upon France.

He failed, of course; and while Paris was occupied by the allied army and France restored to its Bourbon kings, Napoleon abdicated as Emperor of the French and became for a year the Prince of Elba. From this island retreat he emerged to make a last despairing effort to regain his power and his "glory." Three months more ("The Hundred Days," March 20 to June 29, 1815) were given him in which to summon France again to arms, to raise a new army and to fight three preliminary battles, before his crushing defeat at Waterloo by the English and Germans under Wellington and Blücher. After this, he abdicated again and retired for good to the African island of St. Helena. Here he lingered in physical and mental suffering for a half-dozen years, and then departed from this earth, having caused approximately one million victims to be offered upon the altar of his military ambition.

As for France, she lay "bled white" and exhausted in

every way after the quarter-century of military cyclone. Her boundaries were cut back to where they had been at the beginning of the wars, and they would have been reduced much more, had not her conquerors promptly quarrelled among themselves. Seventeen of her border fortresses were garrisoned by troops of the allies, to be held for five years at the expense of France. She was to pay seven hundred million francs as a war indemnity, and to return the art-treasures which her victorious despot had carried off to Paris from the cities of Italy, Holland and Germany.

During the next generation, France embarked on no more foreign wars in Europe, except to send her army, at the behest of the Holy Alliance of Russia, Prussia and Austria, to crush out a popular uprising in Spain (1823).¹ Her people devoted themselves to economic recuperation and to the political enfranchisement which they had failed to secure amidst the violence and war of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era. Her economic restoration was greatly facilitated by the Industrial Revolution, whose beneficent agencies of peace,—the application of steam-power and machinery to manufacture, transportation, etc.,—speedily restored and advanced her prosperity to a greater height than it had ever reached before.

The winning of political and religious liberty was finally achieved, but not without another dose of empire and several more revolutions. These revolutions were much more sane and peaceful than the first, however, and the present (Third) French Republic appears to be settled on a sound foundation. The Bourbon kings, restored after Napoleon's fall, were overthrown in the Revolution of 1830, which lasted for three days (July 27, 28 and 29) and was accompanied by very little fighting in the streets of Paris, the king's army siding with the people against their common despot.

An Orleanist king, Louis Philippe, ruled with far more liberality than had his Bourbon predecessors; but he too

¹ See page 91.

was overthrown by the Revolution of 1848, and the Second Republic was established. This revolution was accompanied by more serious street-fights in Paris between the people and the troops (Feb. 22-24); and when the public workshops, which had been established for the employment of any labourers who were in need of work, were closed by the new government, the labouring class broke into a desperate revolt. This was suppressed by the republican troops with much bloodshed and violence (June 23-26).

The new republic, thus founded, did not last long; and the popular revolts all over Europe, which were kindled by the Revolution in France and were based on similar violence, also failed. Unfortunately for France, the two classes of employer and employed, which had grown very hostile during the Industrial Revolution, resorted to the old war-method of force and violence to settle their disputes. Unfortunately, also, the old French worship of military "glory" had been aroused anew and inflamed by the bringing of Napoleon's body to Paris and its entombment with nation-wide glorification under the resplendent dome of the Invalides at Paris.

Napoleon's nephew, Louis Napoleon, utilized this twofold opportunity, secured the aid of the militarists, overthrew the republic, imprisoned and banished its officials, and had himself first elected President for ten years (December, 1851), and then declared by the Senate to be "Napoleon III, Emperor of the French" (December, 1852).

Having raised himself to the imperial throne on the ladder of military "glory," Napoleon III found himself obliged to achieve military and imperialistic victories, and within a year led France into a war with Russia. Since the overthrow of Napoleon I, England had immensely increased its empire beyond the seas and, although France had made a modest attempt to renew its over-seas empire by beginning the conquest of Algeria (1830), there seemed to be little danger of the renewal of the old rivalry and hostility between England and France. England, too, was by this

time well launched on its imperialistic rivalry with Russia in the attempt of both powers to control Turkey and Central Asia. When Russia, therefore, threatened to occupy Constantinople and release the subject Balkan lands from Turkish rule, England and Napoleon promptly made an alliance against Russia and sent a joint French and English fleet to protect the Turkish capital (1853).

Austria and Prussia refused to ally themselves with Russia, but the Czar pushed on the war alone, sent his army across the Danube, and the so-called Crimean War began (1853-56). A Franco-British fleet attacked Northern Russia by way of the Baltic, but achieved no success. In the south, the Russians were at first victorious over the Turks, but were defeated by a Franco-British-Turkish fleet and army, which engaged in a terrible winter-siege of the Russian fortress-city of Sebastopol, on the peninsula of Crimea (October, 1854, to September, 1855). Three or four battles were fought; almost daily skirmishes occurred; many desperate attacks upon the city were repulsed with much slaughter on both sides; an almost continuous bombardment was kept up for months; citizens and soldiers died in large numbers from illness and famine; the war spread to the Black Sea coast of Asia; and finally the city was captured and the war came to an end.

In the peace made at its end, Sebastopol was given back to the Russians, who were forbidden to maintain a naval base in the Black Sea, and who of course seized the opportunity of the next European war to disregard this prohibition (1870). Turkey-in-Europe was saved for a time by England and France who came to its rescue at the end of another Russo-Turkish war (1878), only to struggle desperately in the World War of 1914-18, in alliance with Russia, to drive the Turks out of Europe and give Constantinople to the Russians! Such is the kaleidoscope of imperialistic diplomacy.

Napoleon III, having achieved this "victory" over Russia and joined England in an expedition against China

to force the admission of European goods and Christian missionaries into that benighted land (1857-60), next turned upon Austria and in alliance with the Italians sent his armies to free Italy from the Austrian yoke (1859-60). This bloody war has already been described;¹ but it was not its bloodshed, but rather the imperialistic interests of France, which caused Napoleon to withdraw from it before Italy was "freed," and to demand from his Italian allies the cession to France of Savoy and Nice.

The next opportunity for imperialism and "glory" was found by Napoleon in Mexico, at a time when the United States of America was torn asunder by its own terrible civil war (1861-65). At first in alliance with England and Spain, the joint expedition captured Mexico's seaport, Vera Cruz, and secured the promise of the president of the Mexican Republic to pay the debt which the allies claimed. England and Spain thereupon withdrew, but Napoleon determined to overthrow the Mexican Republic, set up a monarch of his own choice upon the Mexican throne and summon the Mexicans and other Latin-Americans to join with the French and Spaniards in developing on both sides of the Atlantic a vast Latin power which should check the spread and supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon peoples of England, Germany and America, who were supposed to be so greatly strengthened by the rise of Prussia!

The French army in Mexico, after its repulse at Puebla, was reinforced by 25,000 men and, several larger contingents coming later, it captured Puebla and Mexico City, and set up Napoleon's choice, Maximilian of Austria, on the "imperial" throne of Mexico. The new empire did not long endure; for the Mexicans supported their republican armies in the bloody battles that continued, the United States of America emerged from its civil war united and demanded the withdrawal of the French army and empire from its sister-republic, and the triumph of Prussia over Denmark (1864) and Austria (1866) gave Napoleon III

¹ See pages 109-10.

more than enough to think of in Europe, in addition to his growing unpopularity with the French people. He accordingly withdrew the French troops from Mexico (1867), and left his protégé-emperor, Maximilian, to struggle on alone for a few months, and then to be captured, tried and executed by his Mexican opponents (June, 1867).

Napoleon, having been immersed in his Mexican adventure while Prussia and Austria were bringing their rivalry to a conclusion in the War of 1866, was alarmed by Prussia's greatness, chagrined that France had not gained "indemnification" for Prussia's recent growth, and determined to make good if possible his recent failure. He therefore began to negotiate with the King of Holland for the purchase of the Grand-duchy of Luxemburg; but Prussia under Bismarck's leadership, aware of and welcoming the coming clash with France, objected so strenuously to Luxemburg's annexation by France that the war between them was on the brink of commencing. A conference of the six "great" powers of Europe at London succeeded, however, in settling the Luxemburg question and postponing the Franco-Prussian War for a time. This conference declared and guaranteed the permanent neutralization of Luxemburg, caused the Prussian troops to evacuate the grand-duchy, and the fortifications of its capital to be destroyed (1867).

In the same year, Napoleon intervened in Italy, to prevent the new Italian kingdom from acquiring the papal territory and making Rome its capital. A French army defeated the Italian attempt upon Rome and garrisoned the city with French troops.

The demands of the liberals and republicans in France were growing stronger and stronger, during these years, and the imperialist government was having more difficulty and more frequent need of suppressing the disaffection and riots against it. The old, old device, therefore, of engaging in foreign war in order to curb revolt against tyrannical rule at home, was urged again upon Napoleon by his advisers, and he yielded to their urging and led the French people

into the fateful Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. Napoleon, remembering his uncle's Leipzig and Waterloo, seems to have been reluctant at the last moment to hazard a contest with Prussia; but his empress and advisers, recalling Jena, kept his courage to the sticking-point. Bismarck, on the Prussian side, was quite as keen as was any one on the side of France to bring the rivalry between France and Prussia, as he had done that between Austria and Prussia, to the arbitrament of the sword. Hence, once more, with bloody and far-reaching consequences, the war-method was grasped and tried.

The battles and sieges of this brief but sanguinary war have been described elsewhere.¹ Suffice it here to stress the immediate consequences to France. After having lost ten or a dozen battles in the field and surrendered the cities of Metz, Strasburg and Sedan, and two entire armies of 280,000 men, the French overthrew their imperial government and formed a provisional government of the "national defense." This government did its best, under the energetic leadership of Gambetta, to raise new armies in the provinces, and to end the siege of Paris (Sept. 19, 1870 to Jan. 28, 1871). But its provincial armies were defeated on the Loire, the desperate sorties of the Paris troops were repulsed with great loss of life, the city was bombarded, another army in the South was almost annihilated at Le Mans and Belfort, one more great sortie of 100,000 troops from Paris was repulsed with severe loss, the last army of the North was defeated and broken to pieces at St. Quentin, and Paris was obliged to surrender.

Thiers, the French statesman who had opposed the war, was called upon to negotiate peace with Bismarck (at Versailles and Frankfort, May 10, 1871). This "peace" included the cession by France to the new German Empire of Alsace and Lorraine,—a territory of 4,700 square miles, and one and a half million inhabitants; the payment of five billion francs within three years, and the military oc-

¹ See pages 139-40.

cupation of French forts until the indemnity was paid; and a two days' occupation of a small part of Paris by 30,000 German troops.

Paris, during the siege, had been reduced to the verge of starvation, all kinds of unnutritious and repellent substances being used as food, and the suffering and mortality being very great. The labouring-class, upon whom the chief burdens of battle and siege always fall, supported several attempts made by their socialist leaders to seize control of the government and to administer it against the profiteers and in the interests of the poor. These attempts were suppressed by military force; but after the surrender of the city and its evacuation by the German troops, the working men seized the heights in the northeastern part of the city, fortified them with cannon, and demanded radical political and economic reforms (March 18, 1871). The army was ordered to suppress the revolt, but several regiments went over to the side of the Commune,¹ and for two months Paris was in the hands of the rebels, while the Provisional Government had its seat at Versailles.

The Paris government formed a National Guard, and with it attacked Versailles, but was repulsed by the Versailles government, which sent its army to besiege Paris. While the German garrisons in the forts on the northeast of the city looked on, the French forces fought each other, the Versailles troops bombarding the city and utilizing the embankments constructed by the Germans in *their* siege of Paris. An unguarded gate admitted the Versailles troops, seven weeks after the second siege began, a week's fierce and sanguinary battles against the city's barricades ensued, and by May 28 the rebellion was suppressed. Some 50,000 rebels were captured or arrested, and many thousands were executed *en masse*, imprisoned for eight years or transported to New Caledonia for life. Paris itself had suffered far

¹ The *Commune* was the smallest unit of the city government, and the *Communists* were those who demanded complete local self-government in and by the Commune.

more during this bitter struggle between Frenchmen than it had done from the Germans, many of the public buildings being destroyed by fire and bombardment.

After this attack of foreign and civil war, the new French Republic struggled painfully upon its feet, but was made to stagger almost to its fall by renewed attacks of militarism and imperialism. General Boulanger, in 1888, attempted on the basis of a demagogic appeal to the army to seize imperial power and start a war of revenge against Germany; he came perilously near succeeding, but proved too weak at the critical moment and was suppressed. Again in 1896, the Dreyfus Case began, and for ten years revealed a formidable gulf in French citizenship between the militarists and republicans, and shook the republic to its foundations.

Meanwhile, France had entered on her plan of "defense through alliances" and gradually developed the Dual Alliance with Russia, the Entente Cordiale with Great Britain, and the Triple Entente with Russia and Great Britain.¹ France had also entered vigorously into imperialistic and naval rivalry with Great Britain, hoping by that route and by alliances to maintain her position as a "great power," and to regain her empire beyond the seas as well.

The long-drawn-out conquest of Algeria (1830-57) started the expansion of France in Africa, and soon afterwards her Asiatic empire was begun by the acquisition of Cochin China and Cambodia (1862-7) and, after another war with China, Tonkin and Annam (1885). In Africa, the French built up a vast empire, Tunis, Dahomey, the French Congo, the Sahara, and Madagascar being taken over in the fourteen years between 1881 and 1895. For a generation, France disputed the British control of Egypt, and in 1898 came to the verge of war with Great Britain over the possession of the Sudan; but France's fear and hatred of Germany outweighed her bitterness toward England, and the Entente Cordiale dissipated for a time

¹ See pages 141, 272-4.

the danger of war between them. France yielded to British control in Egypt and the Sudan, and was left free to conquer Morocco.

Germany's ambition to acquire whatever was left of Africa by the English, French, Portuguese and Italians, led to her entrance into the game of imperialistic rivalry, especially with France in Morocco, and the tension between the rivals nearly precipitated the World War on several occasions before 1914.¹

Imperialistic ambitions, hostile alliances, naval and military rivalry, a reliance upon force: such were the causes of the World War. A very large part of the burden of it was borne by France. Two German thrusts at Paris nearly succeeded; and for four years, millions of Frenchmen and billions of francs were poured into the trenches on the northeastern border to stay the ever-pushing tide of German attack. Nearly one and a half million of her own sons and her colonials' were slain,—a number three times as great as her loss in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71; three million more were seriously or otherwise wounded; a half-million were captured or "missing." Eighteen per cent. of her national wealth was expended (about \$11,000,000,000), and she claimed a reparations sum of \$33,000,000,000. She lost thirty per cent. of her merchant marine; and her navy was neglected during the war because of the expenditure of most all her resources upon her army, so that at the end of the war it had fallen far behind those of the other "great powers." Her coal mines and factories were destroyed in a large part of her industrial districts.

In return, France has regained Alsace-Lorraine; acquired the coal-mines in the valley of the Saar, and the right to hold a plebiscite at the end of fifteen years to see whether the valley itself and its inhabitants shall be annexed to France; secured economic and military control of Luxemburg, and an economic and military alliance with Belgium;

¹ See page 141.

occupied the Left Bank of the Rhine with her troops for a period of from five to fifteen years (dependent on Germany's payment of reparations); caused the destruction of all the German fortifications on the French border, in the Rhineland, and in a strip thirty miles wide east of the Rhine; reduced the German army to 100,000 men; prevented universal military training and service in Germany; destroyed the German air-fleet; seen the destruction of the German navy.

But infinitely worse than the material losses which France has suffered, and infinitely more important than the loss of Germany's military, naval and economic strength, was the recrudescence of the spirit of militarism in the minds of the two peoples. Germany overcame this and turned over a new leaf; ¹ but it persisted in France in the form of renewed attempts to build up alliances,—with Belgium, and especially with Poland, Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, the Balkan States and Turkey. Its most acute embodiment was in the resort of the French government to a military occupation of the Ruhr Valley, an attempt to coerce Germany by the use of military force; the maintenance of an army of 675,000 men; a refusal to consider at the Washington Conference and elsewhere the reduction and limitation of land forces; a reluctant and long-delayed consent to reduce and limit capital ships in accordance with the agreements of the Washington Conference; ² and a loudly proclaimed intention to build up a great air-fleet and submarine flotilla. All this was evidently the result of fear,—immediate fear of Germany and ultimate fear of Great Britain.

There have been times in French history when, amidst the desert of warfare and preparations for war, there have been oases of peace sentiment and organization of the means of making and preserving peace both at home and abroad. For example, at the beginning of the Thirteenth Century, the wager of battle was prohibited in France as

¹ See pages 145-7.

² See pages 289-90.

a method of settling disputes between individuals by a resort to force. As long ago as 1264, King Louis IX of France arbitrated a quarrel between Henry III of England and his barons; and his grandson accepted the arbitration of the pope in the quarrel between France and England over the lands in Southern France. Three centuries ago, Henry IV of France proposed the establishment of a "Christian Republic," to include all the states of Europe for the maintenance of peace. In recent years, the French delegations at the first and second Conferences at The Hague were among the foremost in advocating conciliation, arbitration and international courts as means of peacefully settling international disputes.

The difficulty since the World War has been that in France, as in every other country, there is an unended competition and conflict between the war-method and the peace-method. In France, the outcome of this conflict was peculiarly uncertain because, in spite of Christianity and a high degree of civilization, the poison of military "glory" has been so long and so dramatically infused into the French body politic that the disease is peculiarly virulent and difficult to shake off. Fear of a great, growing and menacing neighbour across the Rhine, and of a great, growing and potentially menacing neighbour across the Channel, has accentuated the virulence of this poison; while Christianity, instead of being heroically applied to assuage the fear and eject the poison, has actually been summoned, under the distorted memory of Joan of Arc, to justify and sanctify the resort to military force.

Frenchmen, with their intellectual gifts, and France, with the great affection felt for her and the influence she exerts in our modern world, are sadly needed in the present struggle to banish the war-method and establish the exclusive, perpetual and effective methods of peace. Within the last five years, as the fear of war and the love of victory have declined, France has given several striking evidences of its will to peace. The inclusion of its former foe, Germany,

within the mutual pact of Locarno, in 1925; its offer through Foreign Minister Briand to outlaw war forever with the United States, in 1927; and its ratification of the Kellogg Pact, in 1929, are conclusive proof that its citizens are appealing from Philip drunk to Philip sober,—from the method of war to the method of peace. There is fair promise also at the present moment that it will coöperate fully with the United States and Great Britain in striking at armaments of every kind, on land and sea and in the air. When it renounces these provocatives and instruments of war, it will doubtless proceed to a repudiation of all military alliances beyond the pale of the League of Nations, and even consent to placing the League itself on a non-military basis.

England and the British Empire

The military history of England began before the English came. In prehistoric times, there was doubtless much warfare between the different tribes of Iberians, Goidels and Britons while they were settling in their island homes. It is rather improbable that the Phœnicians reached the island in their search for tin; but Greek settlers opened the tin-mines of Cornwall and the Greek cities of the Mediterranean sent thither their traders, one of whom, Pytheas of Marseilles, wrote the first extant account of the island, and thus opened it up to history (ca. 350 B. C.).

The Britons traded, and perhaps fought with the Gauls of the mainland; and when Julius Cæsar conquered the Gauls, he deemed it necessary to make two expeditions into Britain, to intimidate its inhabitants and prevent their making raids or sending aid to Gaul (55 and 54 B. C.). A few skirmishes occurred between the Romans and Britons, and Cæsar soon retired to Gaul, having by no means conquered the island.

The Roman conquest began about a century later (43 A. D.), and in about forty years it was fairly complete. The tribes south of the Avon and Severn were first subdued

by the Roman legions; a massacre of seventy thousand Roman soldiers and settlers was avenged by the slaughter of eighty thousand Britons; and in seven summer campaigns, the Roman general Agricola carried the Roman rule across northern England and southern Scotland as far as the foot-hills of the Highlands. Here he built a line of forts across the island, to defend the south against the more barbarous Caledonians; and his successors built earth and stone walls for the same purpose, hoping to hold in check the fierce Highlanders, while they subdued and civilized the inhabitants of the Lowlands of Scotland and of England.

They never did succeed in completely conquering all the British tribes; but they ruled throughout most of the island for nearly four hundred years, and imposed the Græco-Roman culture upon it. Britain became a regular province of the Roman Empire and participated in the peace and warfare of the empire, during these four centuries. Britons were recruited for the imperial armies and served in many a garrison and fought on many a battle-field in distant lands for their imperial masters, or in support of some rival claimant to the throne. In Britain itself, garrisons were maintained to suppress revolts and to beat off the raids of Picts in the north, of Scots from Ireland, and of Frankish and Saxon pirates attacking Britain from the south and east.

When the Teutons began their invasions and conquest of the Roman provinces on the continent, the Roman garrisons were withdrawn from Britain, and for a time the island reverted to its native rulers (410 A. D.). But the raids of the "outside barbarians" continued and grew more and more serious, until the Teutonic Jutes, Saxons and Angles, coming from Denmark, Schleswig and Holstein, began to bring their families and flocks and make permanent settlements (449).

These migrations came in successive waves, and each wave was combatted by the Celto-Roman inhabitants as it rolled farther inland from the coast. For about a century

and a half (449 to 607), this process of invasion, conquest and settlement went on, accompanied by siege and sack of cities and great destruction of property and buildings, especially the Christian churches, so detestable to the heathen invaders. At times, the Britons made a resolute stand, like that of thirty years which tradition attributed to King Arthur (520-552); at others, their strongholds, like those at Anderida and Chester, were captured and burned and their garrisons and inhabitants massacred.

At last, all the island except Wales and the Highlands of Scotland was conquered and settled; the newcomers started their rural activities,—despising cities and civilized life; and ten or a dozen Jutish, Saxon and English kingdoms were founded. These kingdoms promptly began to fight one another for supremacy, and first the Jutish Kingdom of Kent, then the English Kingdoms of Northumbria and Mercia, and finally the Saxon Kingdom of Wessex, gained the military “overlordship.” This period of two centuries and a half (590-825) was filled with much confused warfare and many battles and skirmishes, which have been likened to the battles of the kites and crows, and indeed but little more importance attaches to most of them.

The attempts to Christianize the conquerors were begun about the time of their triumph (597), and the wars between the rival kingdoms which followed were in part wars of religion, with all the bitterness and cruelty which characterize such wars. Mercia was the stronghold of heathenism and one of its kings, Penda, struggled for thirty years to check and root out the new and “unmanly” religion of Christianity. One of his allies in the struggle was a Christian king of Wales, Cadwallon, who hoped by means of his heathen ally to conquer the heathen conquerors and the conquerors who had become Christian as well. Two Christian kings of Northumbria were defeated and slain in two bloody battles, and Cadwallon and Penda were themselves defeated and slain in two others.

But far stronger forces than warfare were at work in the

Christianizing and civilizing of the "English," as all the invaders came gradually to be called. Missionaries, parish priests and monks, traders and teachers of many kinds laboured faithfully and devotedly among them, and slowly but surely the barbarians were learning the arts and ideals of civilization. Then the tide of the "later barbarian" invasions burst upon them. The Northmen, or Danes as they were called in England, began to raid the English coasts, capturing and burning towns and churches and carrying off all the movable wealth they could find.

For more than two hundred years, these invasions went on, taking like those of the Angles and Saxons before them, at first the form of mere destructive and despoiling raids, then of settlement, and finally of conquest (787-1016). Occasionally the English kings would gain what appeared to be decisive victories over the Danish hordes, like those of Hengestesdun (836), Ethandun (878) and Brunanburgh (937); but the Danes would capture the cities and settle in various parts of the country, exacting permission of the kings to rule themselves; then when the kings, like Alfred, Edward the Elder and Athelstan, reconquered them, new bands of invaders would come pouring in and once more conquer and settle.

One of the kings began the policy of trying to check further raids by paying tribute; and when this failed and almost annual raids continued, he gave orders that all the Danes who had come to England since the payment of tribute began should be massacred. Accordingly, on St. Brice's Day, 1002, an indiscriminate massacre carried off unknown thousands of men, women and children, many of whom had become Christians and married English men or women. To avenge this dark deed of blood and deceit, Svend or Swegen of the Forked Beard, King of Denmark, set sail for England with the largest expedition that had yet gone on a raiding expedition. For a dozen years, he captured and destroyed towns, defeated armies or accepted tribute, and had conquered most of England when a stroke

of apoplexy, caused it was said by the apparition of a Christian saint and martyred king, but probably by a drunken bout, put an end to his life.

His son, Cnut, succeeded to the throne of Denmark and to the command of the Danish army in England, and within a few months completed the conquest and ascended the English throne (1016).

During the reigns of Cnut and his two sons, England and Southern Scotland were ruled by Danish kings and earls (1016-42); but the Danes were themselves converted to Christianity and partially civilized, adding gifts of their own to English culture. Cnut, like Theodoric the Ostrogoth and Charlemagne the Frank, was a great admirer of many aspects of civilization, and did his utmost to induce the Danish inhabitants of England to adopt them as speedily and thoroughly as possible. But he adopted and developed, also, the ideal of imperial sway, and strove to found a great Empire of the North, including England, Denmark and Norway, which should rival the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation.

But this ideal could probably not have been realized by a long succession of King Cnuts, and it fell to pieces in the hands of his son. England was again separated from Denmark and Norway and was soon brought into close association with Normandy and the continent. The Danish kings' successor, Edward the Confessor, was the son of an English king and a Norman princess, and had been brought up at the Norman court. His marked preference for Normans and Norman ways caused a civil war in England between the king and Earl Godwin, leader of the English party. At one time, Godwin was defeated and exiled; at another, he triumphed and compelled the king to banish all his Norman favourites and officials.

On Edward's death, Godwin's son Harold was chosen king by the English party; but William, Duke of Normandy, believed it a good opportunity, relying upon the Norman party's opposition to Harold and their preference

for William, to invade and conquer England. After Harold had completed the conquest of Wales, and repelled an invasion by the King of Norway (at Stamford Bridge, September 25, 1066), he was called upon to meet William's army at Senlac, or Hastings. Here, the last of the old English kings was defeated and slain, and his army, so recently victorious over the Norse, was annihilated by the Norman spear and cavalry (October 14, 1066).

Only a century and a half before, the Normans had themselves been heathen barbarians invading France from Norway, and had been permitted by the French king to settle in the province called for them Normandy. Here they had become so quickly and thoroughly Christianized, civilized and Frenchified, that they looked upon the more backward Englishmen as barbarians and set to work to refine and civilize them.

Along with their work of civilization, however, they found their hands full of warfare. The conquest of England itself, begun at Senlac, required six more years of hard and cruel fighting. William, after his first victory, marched up through southern England, burning and destroying as he went; cut off London from reinforcements from the north, and compelled it to surrender; sent his barons to conquer the north, and was himself called thither by the stern resistance of the English (largely of Danish and Norse descent), aided by the fleet of their Danish ally, another Swegen, King of Denmark. The Danish invaders were bought off, and then William crushed the English and ravaged Northumbria so brutally with fire and sword that its fertile and populous vale of York became a desert and did not recover its prosperity within a hundred years. One final revolt, "the Conqueror" was called upon to suppress (in the Fens of Ely, 1071), and then England lay exhausted at his feet. To prevent further revolts, the English noblemen were proscribed from offices and titles, their estates were confiscated, and Norman noblemen took their places. The English peasantry were maltreated in many ways; the French lan-

guage took the place of English in government and religion; and for generations, two rival and hostile peoples lived side by side in mutual hatred and bloody private conflict.

Meanwhile, William and his successors were fighting in defense of their royal power against their rebellious vassals, both in Normandy and England. Having suppressed a rebellion of his Norman barons in England, a few years after the conquest of the English (1075-6), William was immediately called upon to crush a rebellion of his barons in Normandy, with whom his son Robert and brother Odo were allied (1077-80).

His son, William II, suppressed a revolt of his barons, who tried to place his brother Robert on the throne (1090); and his youngest son, Henry, fought his way to the English throne against the opposition of the barons who again tried to crown their favourite Robert. Robert, having returned from the first Crusade, secured the aid of the barons of both Normandy and England, invaded England and was driven out, and then had to sustain an invasion of his Duchy of Normandy, where he was finally defeated and captured by Henry (1100-06). Crusader though he was, his victorious brother clapped him in prison and kept him there until his death, twenty-eight years later! Henry took possession of Normandy, also, and reigned triumphant.

But his triumph was not a permanent one; for he had to make repeated voyages back and forth between England and Normandy to suppress baronial revolts, which smouldered or flared forth whenever his back was turned. His only son was drowned on one of these voyages; and on Henry's death, his barons broke their oath which they had given Henry while living, rejected his daughter Matilda as their sovereign, and called in a fellow-baron, Stephen, Count of Blois, to be their king.

Matilda, who had married the Count of Anjou, began a civil war to secure for herself and her son Henry the crown of England. For eight years this war lasted, Stephen being defeated and captured in one battle (Lincoln, 1141), and

Matilda being finally obliged to return to France (1147). Stephen, to secure the support of his barons in the war, had given them a free hand to build castles and, from these strongholds, to tyrannize over, rob and kill their neighbours. "Robber barons" they became indeed, and from three hundred and sixty-five castles which they are said to have built, they waged war upon one another, and killed, maimed, tortured, robbed and oppressed in many ways the helpless people of town and village.

Matilda's son Henry renewed the civil war against Stephen (1152-3), and for a year or two they besieged and took castles and fought each other in various ways, adding ever increasing misery to the land. Then Stephen's son died, and the war was ended by an agreement that Stephen should be king until his death, and that Henry should succeed him. Following this agreement, they united their forces against the rebel barons, captured many of their castles, and put many of them to death.

When Henry II came to the throne, he found on his hands the same old struggle with the barons, which was greatly intensified by the fact that he had acquired the sovereignty over many jealous and turbulent noblemen in his possessions in central and southern as well as in northern France; but instead of trying to crush them in the same old manner by resorting to military force, he undermined their power by substituting law for war.

In the first place, he realized that he could not end private war without depriving the barons of their means of making it. Under the feudal system, they had the privilege of maintaining small armies of their own, on condition of using them for a certain number of days each year in the service of the king; and with these small armies they fought one another. Henry accordingly summoned his English barons to bring their troops to his army to help fight his battles in France. But by this time the barons in England had become very much attached to their English homes and English way of life, so that they were exceed-

ingly reluctant to engage in foreign war. Henry, therefore, made a bargain with them that instead of maintaining small armies of their own for service of the king, they should pay him a certain sum of money annually (the Great Scutage, 1162). This payment, together with the expense of maintaining armed forces of their own, proved too great a burden upon them, and they gradually reduced the number of their retainers and converted them from soldiers into liveried servants. By this means, Henry not only reduced the military power of the barons, but increased the financial revenue and power of the king.

Henry next sought to substitute peaceful and legal means of settling disputes among his subjects for the prevalent method of "trial by battle," which was simply a combat between the champions of either party to the dispute, based on the theory that God would give victory to the side of the right. To accomplish this revolutionary reform, he developed the germ of our modern jury. For both civil and criminal cases he established a judicial process, known then as "Recognition," in which judges and witnesses to the truth took the place of the old systems of oaths ("Compurgation"), ordeals, and trial by battle (The Assize of Clarendon, 1166).

The advocates of the war-method, of course, had no faith in this new-fangled and "impracticable" method of judicial procedure, and insisted upon the use of their "good right arm" to secure "justice" for themselves and their dependents; the worship of the Big Stick and the Iron Fist was hard to down. But the forces of reason and civilization,—to which the church added its sanction in 1215, by prohibiting ordeals,—were too strong for those of unreason and barbarism; and gradually every one came to see that an appeal to force to settle disputes between people *within* nations is stupid, ineffective and wicked, while the method of courts and juries is rational and effective. So many centuries have passed since this great revolution that to us it seems a mere matter of course that we should resort to

law, and prohibit duels and "lynch law," in settling disputes between individuals. But this reform had to be achieved by patient, persistent effort *within* nations; and the story of it should be of great encouragement to us in our present effort to accomplish the same thing *between* nations: to do away with national armies and navies and air-fleets for the purpose of settling disputes between nations, and to settle these disputes by international courts of justice or other peaceful means.

So effective were Henry II's legal and administrative reforms that he was called upon to suppress only two rebellions of his barons during his long reign (1154-89); and these were chiefly inspired by his rebellious sons, in alliance with the kings of France and Scotland. Henry's son, Richard I, also, had but little trouble with his barons, although he was absent from England during nearly all of his reign (1189-99), fighting in the Third Crusade and against Philip II, King of France. One rebellion there was against him in England, but this was fomented during his absence by his brother John, who desired prematurely to become king.

When John did ascend the throne, his tyranny was such that it united not only the English barons, but the whole English people against him. And after repeated defeats in his wars in France, he was obliged to grant to his barons and people the great body of rights and privileges known as Magna Charta (1215). This charter curbed the power of the king; but instead of making the barons supreme, it created a national assembly (the Great Council), which developed into the Parliament. To Parliament was given the control, first of the feudal revenue of the king, and then of taxation. By means of this control over the power of the national purse, the Parliament, which became an assembly representative of both nobility and common people, secured control over all the forces of the nation,—royal, noble and popular as well. From this time, the people through their representatives in Parliament held the balance of power

between the king and his barons; and by siding with first one party to the old dispute and then with the other, and by insisting upon the use of Henry II's judicial substitute for violence, it put a stop to serious warfare between them, and protected the common people against the tyranny of both.

The cessation of war between the king and the barons was not immediate; for John had no sooner granted the Great Charter than he broke his promises, the barons again took up arms, and John died in the midst of the civil war that followed (1216). The barons were in control during the minority of John's nine-years-old son, Henry III; and when Henry grew to manhood and began to renew his father's tyranny, one of the barons, Simon of Montfort, appealed to the people, summoned their representatives to Parliament (thus founding the House of Commons, 1265), and began another civil war against the king (1263-65). Simon, victorious in one battle, was defeated and slain in the next; but his constructive work lived after him. For his pupil, the next king, Edward I, renewed and established upon a permanent and legal basis the plan of a representative House of Commons and of a Parliament which should speak in the name of all the English people, thereby enabling the king to avoid civil war with his barons, while protecting the people against royal and baronial tyranny alike (1295).

Here again, the history of England supplies an important lesson to us in our modern efforts to prevent war between nations. The establishment of the English Parliament, in which the representatives of the various classes in English society (nobility, clergy and commoners) came together for conference and discussion of their common problems, and to provide peaceful instead of warlike means of settling them, was a forerunner of the International Conferences held at The Hague in 1899 and 1907, and at Washington in 1921-22, and also of the Assembly of the League of Nations. It is not anticipated, of course, that the Interna-

tional Conferences or Assemblies of our time will ever develop the complete legislative power of the Parliaments or Congresses of the separate nations. But it is greatly to be desired and striven for, that they shall provide adequate peaceful means of settling international disputes and of promoting international coöperation in the many great world-tasks which need to be done to-day.

Scotland

During the long struggle between the kings and the feudal barons (1042-1297), England had not been immune from foreign wars. As France and Germany lay side by side and engaged for more than a thousand years in mutual rivalry and slaughter, so England and Scotland lay side by side and for six hundred years carried on numerous wars and almost incessant border warfare with each other.

The Highlands of Scotland had been left unconquered by the Britons, the Romans, the Anglo-Saxons, the Danes and the Normans, who had successively conquered England and the Scottish Lowlands. Hence the Highlanders, being different, were regarded as enemies. They were originally an Iberian people who were intermingled with the Celtic Goïdels, and later with the Scots, who came from Ireland. These people had fought separately against the Britons, Romans, English and Danes in England, but about 850 A. D. had formed the united Kingdom of Scotland.

When William the Norman conquered northern England, the Scots joined with a Danish fleet and the English against him; but the invaders were beaten off and the English subdued (1068). In face of the Norman invasion of the island, the Scotch and English royal houses intermarried and together kept up a fruitless struggle against the Norman conquerors.

The civil war in England between Stephen and Matilda ¹ gave the Scots an opportunity, which they seized by invading England; but they were defeated in the Battle of the

¹ See pages 201-2.

Standards and driven back (1138). The struggle between the English kings and their barons afforded the Scots numerous opportunities for invading England, and some of these they seized on a large scale. For example, William the Lion, King of Scotland, allied himself with the King of France, the English and Norman barons and the rebellious eldest son of Henry II, and invaded England with a large army. He too was defeated and captured (in the Battle of Alnwick), and was released only on condition that he would hold his Scottish throne as vassal of England's king (The Treaty of Falaise, 1173).

When Henry II's son, Richard I, needed money for the Third Crusade, he accepted a sum of money for abandoning the Treaty of Falaise, and Scotland again became independent of England (1189). But a century later, Edward I of England decided a dispute among claimants to the throne of Scotland, all of whom happened to be English barons. In giving his decision, he demanded that Scotland should acknowledge the King of England as its lord paramount. The Scottish nobility and clergy agreed to this demand, but the representatives of the people made a feeble protest. After Edward had decided the dispute in favour of John Baliol, he asserted his sovereignty over Scotland by demanding that law-suits should be appealed from the courts of Scotland to his own (1293).

The Scotch king and people rejected this claim, and made with France a treaty of alliance which lasted three hundred years, and which brought the French and Scottish armies together to fight against the English on many a battle-field. War immediately broke out, and while an English fleet attacked the French, Edward led an English army against the Scotch. He defeated and captured the Scotch king, Baliol, at the Battle of Dunbar (1296), declared himself the King of Scotland, and carried off to Westminster the famous Stone of Scone, on which the Scotch kings had been crowned for centuries. Placed under the coronation-chair in Westminster Abbey, it has been used ever since

as the royal seat of England's sovereigns at their coronations, and has been regarded as the symbol, first of Scotland's subjection, and then of Scotland's union with England.

The Scotch city of Berwick had been captured in this brief war, and some of its garrison and people massacred. Edward then took possession of Edinburgh and attempted to rule the country through his subordinates. These subordinates governed in tyrannical manner, and caused a rebellion to break out under the leadership of a Scotch knight, Sir William Wallace (1297).

At first, Wallace was successful against Edward's governors, defeating them in the Battle of Stirling, driving the English troops out of Scotland, and himself invading northern England, burning and killing for some distance south of the border (1297). But this success was short lived. King Edward returned from a victorious expedition to France and marched his army into Scotland, where his longbowmen and cavalry overwhelmed Wallace's spearmen (the Battle of Falkirk, 1298). Wallace fled to France, but the Scotch continued their resistance, and Edward led several more devastating expeditions into Scotland before it was again subdued (1304).

Soon afterwards, Wallace returned from exile, but was betrayed and executed as a traitor to the English king of Scotland, whose sovereignty he had never recognized (1305). To take his place at the head of the Scotch resistance to English rule, Robert Bruce arose and, supported by all classes within Scotland, was crowned king at Scone. But again, and for the third time, Edward conquered Scotland, defeating Bruce's army (at Methven, 1306), and executing many of his supporters. Bruce himself escaped, and rallied his forces to renew the attack on the English garrisons of the Scotch towns. Once more, Edward led an army toward Scotland, but died just before he reached the border (1307).

His son, Edward II, engaged in quarrels with his English lords for a half-dozen years, while Bruce was reconquering

Scotland; and when he did lead an army of 100,000 men to defend the town of Stirling against Bruce's attack, he was totally defeated at Bannockburn by 30,000 Scottish infantry (1314). Another unsuccessful expedition followed (1323), and then Edward made a truce with Bruce for thirteen years. But within five years, Edward was deposed and assassinated, and his son Edward III (at the age of fifteen!) renewed the war, but without success. Finally, in the Treaty of Northampton (1328) peace was made, Bruce was recognized as king, and England's sovereignty or feudal supremacy over Scotland was definitely renounced.

But still the miserable war lingered on. When Robert Bruce died (1329), his young son David was opposed by a rival claimant, Edward Baliol, who secured English aid, defeated the Scotch army at Dupplin, drove David off to France, and seized the crown. Baliol then did homage to Edward III, the Scotch nobles revolted, civil war again broke out, and Baliol was driven into England. Edward III again came to Baliol's support, destroyed the Scotch army at Halidon Hill (which the English regarded as vengeance for Bannockburn), replaced Baliol on the throne, and secured from him the cession of all the Lowlands of Scotland for annexation to England (1333). Again the Scots drove their unwelcome king into England; again Edward replaced him on his shaky throne.

This "see-saw warfare" raged for many weary years: as long as Edward's English army remained in Scotland, his puppet-king Baliol could be maintained at least as Scotland's nominal ruler; as soon as Edward and his army left for England, Baliol was sent clattering after him. Meanwhile, the farce was accompanied by continual tragedy: a vast deal of property was destroyed, many human lives were blotted out, the people on both sides of the border were debased. How long it would have lasted, or with what result no man can say; for meanwhile, also, the kings of England and France were engaged in those quarrels which led to the Hundred Years' War; and, like the Americans in

their Revolution, four hundred and fifty years later, the Scotch were receiving aid from England's enemy, the French.

While the English were gaining "famous victories" in France (1336-42), David Bruce returned with French aid to Scotland and regained the throne. But not content with this, or as repayment to France, he invaded England, was defeated and captured at Neville's Cross (1346), and was held prisoner by the English king for a dozen years. Meanwhile, his supporters held the Scotch throne for him against his Baliol rival; and Edward of England again invaded and ravaged a large part of Scotland (1356), but without succeeding in compelling the Scotch to accept Baliol and renounce Bruce. He therefore accepted a large money ransom for Bruce, and sent him back to be Scotland's king (1357).

But still the senseless war went on. When a truce was made between England and France, the Anglo-Scottish war would die down into the smouldering flames of border-warfare; when the war in France blazed out again, the Scotch would send troops to their French allies, or would invade and harass the north of England. The border barons, like the Percys in England and the Douglasses in Scotland, kept up an intermittent guerilla war, which burst occasionally into an open battle like that at Chevy Chase, or Otterbourne (1388). As the old ballad tells the tale:

*"Of twenty hundred Scottish spears,
Scarce fifty-five did flee;
Of fifteen hundred Englishmen
Went home but fifty-three."*

And in the battle for revenge which was fought a little later (at Homildon Hill, 1402):

*"In one day fifty knights were slain,
With lords of high renown;
And of the rest, of small account,
Did many hundreds die."*

No wonder that the old ballad should conclude:

*“ God save the king, and bless this land,
With plenty, joy and peace;
And grant henceforth that foul debate
’Twixt noblemen may cease.”*

The “foul debate,” however, was to continue for two centuries longer. The very next year (1403), the surviving Earls of Percy and Douglas joined in a conspiracy against the English king, were defeated in the Battle of Shrewsbury, and Percy was killed, Douglas captured, and many more hundreds of “small account” were left dead on the battlefield. Two years later, the Scottish king, on his way to strengthen his alliance with France, was captured by an English ship, and held prisoner in England for eighteen years. During his imprisonment, the border warfare went on as usual, accompanied by raids on a large scale and with more than usual slaughter and destruction, like “The Foul Raid” of 1417.

The end of the Hundred Years’ War between France and England (1453) might well have brought to a close the even longer war between England and Scotland. But the Wars of the Roses, which broke out in England immediately afterwards (1455), soon brought Scotland again into the field of battle. This war, too, was without much result on either side, except that the border city and fortress of Berwick, which had been taken and retaken again and again in the ebb and flow of the long warfare, was finally ceded to England, and has been a part of England,—surrounded by Scotch counties,—ever since (1480).

After the Wars of the Roses came to an end in England (1485), and Henry VII, of the House of Tudor, was seated on England’s throne, conspiracies broke out against him, and one of the conspirators, Perkin Warbeck, who impersonated the murdered Duke of York, secured the aid of James IV, of Scotland. James’ invasion was repulsed, and the pretended duke was executed, after a good many men had fallen victims to his ambition and to the old enmity between the Scotch and English people (1496–99). Again, when

Henry VIII went to war with France (1511), James of Scotland went to the aid of his French allies, invaded England, and was defeated and slain in the Battle of Flodden Field (1513). James had married Henry's sister Margaret, but this did not prevent their son, James V, from renewing the war against his uncle Henry (1533). But this James too was unsuccessful in his invasion of England, his army was slain or captured in Solway Moss, and James himself died of a broken heart (1542).

Two and a half centuries before this event, the king of England had tried to end the strife between the two kingdoms by proposing a marriage between the heiress to the Scotch throne and the Prince of Wales. But the heiress died on her journey to meet her fiancé (1290), and centuries of war had followed. Again, when James V died and left his throne to an infant daughter, Mary Stuart, the king of England proposed that the young Queen of Scotland should be betrothed to his son Edward, Prince of Wales (1542). But again, war instead of peace, prevailed. Henry was again at war with France, Scotland's ancient ally, and he was also at war with the pope, while Mary's family were devout Catholics. Accordingly, while Henry himself invaded France, he sent his brother-in-law, Lord Hertford, with an English army to invade Scotland. Hertford is said to have burned every house and cottage between Berwick and Edinburgh, and he took Edinburgh itself and burnt it to the ground (1544).

The Scotch were naturally resentful at such rough wooing of their youthful queen, and she was sent to France for safety and for an education, and there she became the wife of a French prince and finally, for a short time, Queen of France (1559-60). On her husband's death, Mary Stuart ceased to be Queen of France, and returned to her throne in Scotland. But in Scotland, the Protestant Revolution, which was a revolt against the old régime *in toto*, had converted the people from Catholicism to Presbyterianism, and Mary soon found herself in the midst of a civil war,

in which her forces were twice defeated and she was driven to England for safety (1567-8).

The Treaty of Edinburgh (1560) had made peace between England and France and Scotland; but Mary Stuart was descended from a king of England, and her cousin Elizabeth, who was on England's throne at the time, feared her as a dangerous rival. Therefore, instead of a refuge, Mary found a prison in England, and in it she was kept for nineteen years (1568-87). During these years, her son, James VI, reigned in Scotland, in her stead; and when Elizabeth died in 1603, the English accepted James as their king James I of England.

This "personal union" of England and Scotland, which gave the same king, but separate parliaments, to the two island kingdoms, lasted for a hundred years. It was a peace-method, like the attempted royal marriages of 1290 and 1542; and it would probably have been successful in putting an end to the centuries of warfare between the two peoples, had not England itself become involved in civil wars.

These wars were begun by James' son, Charles I, who tried to strengthen himself against his English rebels by forcing the Scotch to do his bidding. He ordered the Scotch Presbyterians to discard their religion and accept Episcopalianism; and when they refused to do so, and bound themselves together in the National Covenant to resist his will, he waged the two "Bishops' Wars" against them (1639-40). Defeated in these, Charles tried force against his English subjects, and the Scotch promptly allied themselves in the Solemn League and Covenant with the English rebels, and sent an army to their aid (1643).

The aid of their Scotch allies enabled the English to defeat Charles' army at the decisive battle of Marston Moor (1644); and when Charles surrendered to the Scotch troops, they handed him over to the English and returned to Scotland (1646). Meanwhile, the Scotch had fought a series of battles in Scotland itself against Charles' general, the Mar-

quis of Montrose. In these, they had suffered eight or ten defeats and the destruction of their homes and property in Argyleshire; but at last their troops were victorious at Philiphaugh, and Montrose's raids came to an end.

But the religious quarrel in England between the Presbyterians and the Independents caused Presbyterian Scotland to turn against Independent England and ally itself with its former enemy, Episcopalian King Charles. Charles promised to respect Presbyterianism in Scotland, and the Scots hoped, by restoring him to the throne, to head off the threatened domination of England and Scotland by Cromwell's victorious army. With his new allies, Charles renewed the Civil War, which lasted this time but a few months and ended in his defeat and execution. A Scotch army under the Duke of Hamilton invaded England, and was annihilated by Cromwell in the three days' battle of Preston (1648).

When Cromwell and the Independents executed Charles I and proclaimed a republic, or Commonwealth, including England, Scotland and Ireland, the Scotch proclaimed Charles' son, Charles II, as their king, and prepared for the war with England which they knew was sure to come (1649). Cromwell, too, knew that the Commonwealth would not be safe as long as Charles was king of Scotland; hence, after conquering Ireland, he led an army of 16,000 men into Scotland and totally defeated the Scotch at the Battle of Dunbar (1650). Edinburgh and Glasgow were surrendered to Cromwell; but Charles was crowned at Scone, rallied the Highlanders to his standard, and invaded England. Cromwell followed in rapid pursuit; the English did not rise to support Charles, as he fully expected they would do; and at Worcester the Scotch army was annihilated, while Charles escaped to Scotland and to France (1651).

Cromwell and his army now reigned supreme in England, Scotland and Ireland. But seven years later, on the anniversary of his victories over the Scotch at Dunbar and

Worcester, he died, and the government which he had founded and fought in civil and foreign wars to defend crumbled to pieces. The shadow of the sword had obscured the sunlight of peace and union within the British Isles. Charles II, king at last, was far from being grateful to the Scotch, who had aided him in the days of his weakness and exile. The Solemn League and Covenant was publicly burned; the Covenanters' leaders, the Duke of Argyle and others, were executed; persistent attempts were made to force Episcopalianism upon the people; when they revolted, an army was sent to defeat them (at Pentland Hills, 1666) and execute the rebels; a cruel persecution was started, to root up Presbyterianism completely, and when this caused another open rebellion, in which the Covenanters were at first successful (at Drumclog, 1679), they were totally defeated in another battle (Bothwell-Brigg) and cruelly persecuted by the Duke of York who was soon to become their king (James II, 1685-88).

James was overthrown because of his tyranny in England as well as in Scotland, and the Scotch accepted William of Orange as their new sovereign. William abolished Episcopacy in Scotland and secured the support of most of the people; but the supporters of James appealed to the Highlanders, raised an army, and defeated William's army at Killiecrankie (1689). The Highlanders' leader was killed in the battle, however, and their army was dissolved. William, instead of trying to follow and suppress them by force, offered indemnity and pardon to all the Highland clans who would accept his government before a fixed date. All the clans accepted his offer, and this peace-method might have been permanently successful,—had it not been for a dark deed of cruelty committed upon the one clan that failed to give in its submission by the date assigned. The chieftain of this clan was six days late in proffering his allegiance; and William's vindictive representative used this as an excuse for murdering him and forty of his men, and driving the rest of the clan from their homes to the moun-

tains, where many of them died from cold and exposure (1692).

The Highlanders never forgot the cruel treachery of this deed; and when the Stuarts tried to regain the throne of England and Scotland, in 1715 and 1745, they supplied the backbone of their armies. In the first of these attempts, they were speedily crushed after two defeats (Sheriffmuir and Preston); but in the second, the royal pretender, Prince Charlie, gained Edinburgh and with an army of 2,500 Highlanders defeated the English at Preston Pans. He then invaded England as far as Derby, but failing to rouse Englishmen to his support, he returned to Scotland. Here, he gained one more victory (at Falkirk); but was completely defeated on Culloden Moor, and after romantic wanderings escaped to France.

The victor at Culloden, the Duke of Cumberland, pursued the Highlanders with relentless vigour. Many of them were slaughtered on the field; even the wounded fugitives were tracked to their hiding-places and shot; twenty of them who had taken refuge in a building were forced back into it when the building was set on fire and were burned to death. After such treatment, it might be supposed that the Highlanders would have seized every opportunity to revolt against a government whose agents had acted in such manner toward them. But the Stuart pretenders made no further effort to regain the throne, and soon died out; alluring opportunities, also, were given to the Highlanders to satisfy their martial ardour, earn wages and win "glory" in the armies of England; and the political Union of Scotland and England had already occurred (1707).

The Union of Scotland and England was one of the most drastic and successful applications of the peace-method which history affords. After many centuries of mutual warfare and slaughter, the two peoples voluntarily agreed to live under the same government, send representatives to the same parliament, and become virtually one nation. They have each contributed prime ministers to their com-

mon government, and their respective characteristics have added much to their mutual strength and culture; while under the reign of peace, they have put an end to their former incessant warfare, and made possible a progress in civilization which neither could have achieved under the reign or threat of war.

Wales

Wales, the third division of the island of Great Britain, had a history in its relations with England which is somewhat similar to that of Scotland. It shared in the warfare which the Celtic and Roman periods brought to England and Scotland. When the Angles and Saxons conquered England and the Lowlands of Scotland, the Britons were driven westward into the mountain-fastnesses of Wales; and here they resisted the Anglo-Saxon advance for some centuries with success.

A king, who gave rise to the legends of Arthur, rallied them for a generation against the invaders (520-550); then their chief center, Chester, was captured (607); the northern half of their people was gradually conquered and incorporated in the English kingdom; but in Wales proper, the Britons held out, in many generations of bloody warfare, against Saxon, Dane and Norman alike.

These successive conquerors of England attempted to conquer Wales as well; but when they found it impossible to pursue the Welsh people to their mountain homes and exterminate them there, they built fortresses along the border, filled them with garrisons, and left the soldiers and the people to keep perpetual watch upon each other and to engage in perpetual raids for mutual destruction. The Welsh, meanwhile, seized every opportunity of siding with the successive invaders of England and of entering promptly into active alliance with first one and then another of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in their civil wars.

The first Angevin king of England, Henry II, decided to end the struggle and incorporate Wales with England. But

he resorted, unfortunately, to the war-method, instead of trying the various peace-methods which he used with such success against his warlike barons in England and France. The three wars which he launched against the Welsh failed to conquer them and only increased their hatred of the English (1158-65).

Henry's immediate successors had their hands full of wars elsewhere; but his great-grandson, Edward I, ambitious to unite Wales and Scotland with England, and convert the English into the British kingdom, set out to conquer the rest of Great Britain. He first turned upon Wales, and in a series of campaigns succeeded in suppressing the armed resistance of the Welsh people (1276-84). His army marched into Wales and defeated the Welsh army under Llewellyn, Prince of Wales, while the Welsh people fled with their cattle to the mountains; but then the English, instead of burning and destroying everything they could lay hands on and returning to England, settled down in winter quarters to spend the rest of the year. The Welsh, thus forced by the need of pasture and grain to come down from the mountains into the valleys and towns, gave in their submission. Their prince ceded to Edward a large part of the coast-land, and acknowledged him as sovereign (1276-77).

But superior force failed to complete the conquest. Llewellyn and his brother David appealed to the people against the English tyranny, the Welsh bards sang of the "glories" of past wars, and a determined revolt broke out (1282). Again Edward came with an army, dispersed the Welsh troops, killed Llewellyn, captured and executed David,¹ and crushed all open resistance (1284). But this time he was wiser than to depend upon brute force to prevent further revolt. As in England, he decided to substitute conciliation and law for war and tyranny. He accordingly left them in possession of their lands and prop-

¹ But he does not appear to have indulged in a wholesale "massacre of the bards," as the old legend states.

erty, gave them a large share in their own local government; enacted a body of laws for them consistent with their own customs and ideals; and, to make them feel that they had a share in the government of England, conferred upon his son and successor, who was born in one of their castles, the title of Prince of Wales.

Thus the Welsh have seen, throughout the last six centuries, one who bears the old historic title of their rulers, the Prince of Wales, ascend the common throne of England and Wales; they have supplied at least one prime minister, David Lloyd George, to be the chief executive of the British Empire; they have sent their representatives to the common British Parliament at Westminster; and they have maintained their local self-government in education, religion, language and courts of justice. And this substitution of the peace-method for the war-method has been as successful as in the case of Scotland.

Ireland

Ireland, the fourth chief division of the British Isles, has had a far sadder history than that of any of the others; and this was due to the fact that in its case the peace-method was rejected, and the war-method was applied, until our own day. At last, in 1922, the peace-method was agreed upon, and the sun of national prosperity and happiness dawned for Ireland; but many past centuries of war and its miseries have been Ireland's unhappy lot.

The prehistoric warfare which raged in Ireland appears to have been particularly severe; for legend has exaggerated it by telling of *five* formidable invasions and conquests by peoples from the continent. The Celtic Scots and Erse probably did migrate in successive waves to the island and engage in warfare with its prehistoric Iberian inhabitants; and then, having reached the broad Atlantic, bands of them turned eastward again, crossed St. George's Channel and invaded and settled in various parts of the English, Welsh and Scotch coasts and border lands.

The Romans did not conquer Ireland, or make it a part of their wide-spreading Empire; but they did send Christian missionaries thither, under the leadership of St. Patrick, who together with the later monks and the traders converted the Irish to Christianity and civilization (ca. 450 A. D.). So well was this work done that Ireland became a center of culture and itself sent forth many missionaries to England, Scotland and Germany to convert the heathen and civilize the barbarian.

The Angles and Saxons, the Danes and the Normans, who conquered England, did not conquer Ireland; but numerous invasions of it were made by the Norse, who settled in Dublin and other Irish towns. Neither these invaders, nor the Irish themselves, succeeded in uniting the various Irish tribes into a single Irish nation; hence there was much civil warfare among the chieftains, and much misery among the clansmen.

Pope Adrian IV, the only Englishman who has ever been elected pope, acting on the theory that all islands belonged to the pope, presented Ireland to King Henry II of England, hoping that the Irish church would be brought thereby into more regular association with the papacy (1154). About twenty years later, when Henry had aroused the indignation of the pope because of the assassination of Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, he determined to allay the papal displeasure, recover his own lost prestige and make another addition to his realm, by conquering Ireland (1171). For some time before this, English and Welsh knights had flocked over to Ireland to win land and fortune by their swords; their activities increased the reign of cruelty and violence, and their growing feudal power was a menace to the royal power of Henry, who was doing his utmost to curb the power of his barons in England and France. Henry therefore led an expedition to Ireland and secured the submission of the knights and the clergy. But Henry's tasks elsewhere prevented him from associating with him the Irish people in the adoption of the peace-

methods which were putting an end to feudal violence and warfare in England; and hence Ireland was by no means conquered, pacified or organized by his expedition.

The English who remained in Ireland were concentrated around Dublin, in the southeastern part of the island, and although they became partially assimilated to their Irish neighbours, they did not assimilate the Irish to themselves or develop a common nationality. During one of the truces in the Hundred Years' War with France, the English king, Edward III, sent his son to extend by law and political organization the English rule in Ireland (1361-67). A parliament, representative of the English colonists only, was assembled at Kilkenny; but it unwisely passed a statute which prohibited intermarriage between the English and Irish, enforced the English language, laws and customs within "the Pale" (as the English part of Ireland was called), left the Irish outside of the Pale to live and act as they pleased, and tried to cut off communication as much as possible between the two. This naturally caused the growth of an English colony within Ireland, and permanent disunion and mutual hostility between the two peoples.

Hostilities began at once, and were increased when the English renewed their war with France (1369). Thus Ireland, like Scotland, became an ally of England's enemies. Even in the days of Robert Bruce, his brother Edward had invaded Ireland hoping to utilize it and the Irish in the Scotch war against England (1315). Edward Bruce was defeated and slain by the English barons in Ireland; but his example was to be followed on many historic occasions, and his attempt helped greatly to alienate the two races in Ireland.

In England's civil, as well as foreign, wars, Ireland was looked upon by the warring sides as a source of aid. Richard II, during his quarrels with the English barons, led two expeditions to Ireland (1394, 1399), for the purpose both of aiding the English there and of strengthening his own hand in England. He failed in both of these objects. But

during the civil Wars of the Roses, his example was followed by Richard, Duke of York, who secured allies and recruits in Ireland for his struggle against the Lancastrians for the possession of the English throne (1455-85). The Lancastrians also secured aid in Ireland, and Anglo-Irishmen fought one another both within the Pale in Ireland and on the bloody battle-fields of the Roses' Wars in England.

When Henry VII had triumphed in these wars, Ireland became the base of an expedition to overthrow him (1487). The pretended Earl of Warwick, who was in reality Lambert Simnel, son of an Oxford tradesman, found support in Ireland and led thence an Irish and German force which was annihilated by Henry in the Battle of Stoke. Another pretender, Perkin Warbeck of Flanders, who gave himself out to be the Duke of York, also sought and received aid in Ireland, as well as in Scotland (1491-97); but he forsook his army and surrendered to Henry before fighting a battle.

When the real Duke of York had sought aid in Ireland, he claimed to be Lord Lieutenant, and in that capacity assented to an act of the Anglo-Irish parliament at Dublin which asserted its complete legislative independence of England (1459). But Henry VII, who was opposed to this independence and especially to Ireland continuing to supply aid to his enemies, compelled a parliament held at Drogheda to enact a law that no parliament should be held in Ireland without the consent of England's king, and that no bill should be brought before the Anglo-Irish parliament which had not previously been approved by the king and his council in England (Poyning's Act, 1494).

With the reign of Henry VIII and the coming of the Protestant Revolution in England, the fires of religious bitterness and hatred were added to those of government and race. Henry moved more by absolutism than by religion, determined to conquer all of Ireland and enforce his royal will outside of, as well as within, the Pale. He therefore summoned the most powerful of the Anglo-Irish lords, the Earl of Kildare, to London and, on the charge of treason,

imprisoned him in the Tower. A rebellion of the Earl's clansmen (the Geraldines) was suppressed by the use of heavy cannon and the execution of all the males of Kildare's family, with the exception of two boys (1534-5). Henry then summoned an Anglo-Irish parliament, which asserted Henry's royal supremacy over all Ireland, and ordered the native Irish to become exactly like the English in language, dress (even to the hair-cut), and religion. A Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, appointed and controlled by Henry, ordered all the sacred relics and images to be destroyed. Henry's lieutenant governor waged successful warfare against the Irish outside of the Pale. A new parliament, which was attended for the first time by Irish chiefs from outside the Pale, gave Henry the title of "King of Ireland," in place of that of "Lord of Ireland" conferred upon Henry II by the pope. Then Henry tried the foolish method of winning the Irish chieftains to Englishry by bribing them with the spoils of the Irish abbeys, and of compelling the Irish people by the use of military force to turn themselves into Englishmen.

Henry's policy toward Ireland had been dictated largely by the fear that the island would become a base of attack upon England by England's French and Spanish foes. Henry's children, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth, were influenced by the same fear. Edward, the Protestant, tried to secure Ireland's peace and friendship by entrusting to the Irish chieftains the task of preserving law and order. But Mary, the Catholic, began the evil policy of sending English colonists to occupy the lands of the Irish rebels in King's and Queen's Counties. Between these colonists and the natives a war of extermination began there at once and lasted until late in Elizabeth's reign. By the process of mutual slaughter, the colonists were reduced in number and the natives were either massacred or expelled.

This local war of extermination was followed by a widespread revolt of the Irish, aided by Spaniards and Italians (1579-83). Three times in three years the rebels, their

leaders and foreign allies were defeated and slain, while the common people perished of starvation and disease. In a single year (1582), 30,000 victims are said to have perished; and an English witness records that out of every corner of the woods and glens the survivors came creeping forth upon their hands and knees, for their legs could not bear them, speaking like ghosts crying out of their graves, and happy to find and feed upon the carrion putrefying in the fields.

Renewed attempts were then made to colonize Irish lands with English farmers. Robbery, arson and murder followed, resorted to by both sides, until another formidable insurrection broke out (1594-1603). Its leader, O'Neill of Ulster, totally defeated an English army on the Blackwater; all Ireland rose to his support; and Elizabeth's favourite, the Earl of Essex, sent with another large force to conquer Ireland, saw his army melt away before a decisive battle.

But where Essex had completely failed, Mountjoy nearly succeeded. He adopted the plan of building forts, to which his soldiers could retreat after defeat, and from which they could be sent to devastate the enemy's country and subdue its inhabitants by starvation. Although another Spanish fleet and army came to Ireland's aid, and although the people resorted to every kind of food and even to cannibalism to combat starvation, Mountjoy's systematic cruelty prevailed and this rebellion also came to an end, and the chiefs of the Ulster tribes fled to Spain.

Elizabeth's successor, James I, declared that because of the rebellion, six counties of the Province of Ulster were forfeited to the English crown. Then, ignoring the Irish law that the land belonged, not to the fugitive chiefs, but to the tribes as a whole, he proceeded to parcel it out among English and Scotch colonists. Again, local wars of extermination began; but James' son, Charles I, and his governor in Ireland, Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, believed that *more* English colonists would cure Ireland's ills. They therefore confiscated the land in the Province of Connaught

and did their best to induce English and Scotch farmers to go over and colonize them, as well as to increase the Anglo-Scotch settlements in Ulster.

But Charles was more intent on conquering his enemies in England, and he looked upon Ireland as a support in the civil war that was looming up there. Strafford accordingly governed Ireland by arbitrary rule, as an object-lesson for England; and he raised an Irish army and prepared it for use in Scotland, or perhaps if necessity arose in England as well. Before Charles conquered either Scotland or England, however, a terrible revolt and massacre occurred in Ireland (1641). The Irish lords were determined to secure toleration for the Catholic religion, which was threatened by Charles' Episcopalianism, and the Irish peasants were determined to regain the lands which had been taken from them. The rebels first tried to seize Dublin and take possession of the government; and when this failed, they turned savagely upon the Scotch and English settlers in Ulster and massacred thousands¹ of men, women and children. All Ireland, too, practically fell into their hands.

Charles continued throughout the Civil War in England to bargain with the Irish leaders to send him an army, and did receive from them a force which was defeated on an English battle-field (Nantwich); but when Charles was finally defeated and executed, Cromwell determined to suppress the Irish rebellion and add Ireland to the Anglo-Scotch Commonwealth. On the other hand, the English Royalists flocked over to Ireland to join with the rebels and secure an Irish army for the overthrow of the Puritan Commonwealth. Hence the Irish war became one between the Irish Catholics and English Episcopalians on one side, and the English Puritans on the other; and between the Irish and English Royalists on one side, and the English Republicans on the other. It was embittered therefore by religious, political and racial animosities, as well as by the economic

¹ The lowest estimate which reached England was 30,000; but this is now believed to be a great exaggeration.

grievance of land-confiscation, and by the preceding local wars of extermination which had just ended in national rebellion and massacre.

Cromwell landed with his army in Ireland; stormed Drogheda, where he killed 2,000 of the garrison who refused to surrender; captured Wexford and Waterford, where he slaughtered not only the soldiers, but also some priests and women; and, having seen the rebellion nearly suppressed, returned to England, leaving his lieutenant to complete the conquest (1649-52). The sword having done its work, Cromwell now tried to "settle" Ireland by applying another war-method, namely, confiscation of lands and forced colonization. The lands in the major part of three of the four provinces were confiscated, and such inducements were offered to English and Scotch Protestants to settle upon them that within thirty years after the conquest, two-thirds of all Ireland's lands which were fit for cultivation were occupied by the newcomers, the former Irish Catholic land-owners being reduced to the condition of tenants, day-labourers, or exiles.

This land-robbery, accompanied by religious persecution and an alien rule, supplied continual fuel for revolt; and since the Irish House of Commons, instead of representing the whole Irish people, represented only Irishmen of English or Scotch descent and of the Protestant religion, the Irish believed that there was no way out of their trouble except by revolt and alliance with England's foreign foes. Accordingly, when James II was deposed from the English throne and landed in Ireland with an army of French allies, the native Irish flocked to his standard (1689). The Scotch and English were driven by a reign of terror into the fortified towns of Londonderry and Enniskillin, where they were besieged and strictly blockaded, and reduced to feeding on dog-flesh and horse-hides.

James' successor and opponent, William III, came to the aid of his Irish supporters, defeated James' army at the Battle of the Boyne (1690), and drove him and his French

allies to France. Ireland again sullenly submitted to English force, and a treaty was made at Limerick providing that all Irishmen who so desired should be permitted to emigrate to France, while those who remained should have toleration for their religion. While James had been in control, an Irish parliament had provided for the restoration of the land to its former Irish owners, with compensation to those Scotch and English colonists who had acquired the confiscated land by purchase. But now nothing was done about the land, and even the religious articles in the Treaty of Limerick were ignored, and religious persecution renewed, so that Limerick is known to this day as "the City of the Violated Treaty."

The Irish Penal Laws provided for the punishment of Catholics in various ways: If one son of a Catholic father turned Protestant, he was to inherit all his father's property; Catholic children, on the death of their father, were given to Protestant guardians to be brought up as Protestants; a Catholic priest who converted a Protestant to Catholicism was to be imprisoned, and one who performed a marriage ceremony between a Catholic and Protestant was to be hanged; banishment or death was imposed on priests who refused to take an oath of allegiance which no conscientious priest could take; and fine and imprisonment were inflicted on all persons refusing to give evidence against the priests. Irish agriculture, commerce and manufactures, as well as religion, were attacked in order to protect English producers against Irish competition. First, Irish agricultural products were forbidden to be imported into England; then, when Irish manufactures began to spring up, the Irish were forbidden to export their woolen goods to any country except England, where prohibitive duties practically barred them out (1699).

Ireland's parliament was representative only of Anglo-Irish Protestants, and hence of only about one-fourth of the people. It was restricted by Poyning's Act of 1494, which required the consent of England's king in council

before a bill could be presented in the Irish parliament; and in George I's reign, an act was passed by the British parliament which declared that laws passed by that parliament should be binding upon Ireland also (1720). Legislative independence or "Home Rule" became, therefore, the slogan of all Irishmen, Protestant and Catholic alike; and they eagerly awaited the best opportunity of compelling England to grant it to them. The American Revolution, which renewed the war between England and France (1778), afforded such an opportunity. The Protestants of Ireland declared that they would defend their island against the French, since the English had no troops to spare for that purpose, and within three years they enrolled an army of 80,000 "Volunteers." They then demanded legislative independence, and the British Parliament, having learned a lesson from the revolt of the American colonists, conceded it to them (1782).

But this Irish parliament represented only the Protestant fourth of the population, and represented it only in name, while in fact it was controlled entirely by the Lord Lieutenant, who was appointed by the British government. It could not, therefore, secure economic equality for Ireland; and it did not desire to repeal the penal laws against the Catholics, to relieve the Catholics of supporting the Anglican Church in Ireland, or to enable the bulk of the Irish people, Catholic or Protestant, to be represented in the Irish parliament. Hence, when England became involved in the French Revolutionary War, the people, Protestants and Catholics alike, joined together as United Irishmen and appealed to France to help them, as it had helped the Americans, to establish an independent republic (1796). The French responded to the appeal and sent a large fleet with 20,000 men to "free Ireland." This fleet was dispersed at sea, and those of its ships which reached Ireland were prevented from landing, by a violent storm. Another small French force succeeded in landing the next year (1798), but it was easily overpowered. An army of Irish rebels was also defeated (at

Vinegar Hill, 1798), and open revolt was suppressed with cruel severity.

Meanwhile, a terrible reign of terror was running its course in Ireland. The Catholic peasantry committed horrible atrocities upon their Protestant oppressors; the Protestants withdrew from the United Irishmen and, forming bands of militia and irregular guerillas, under the name of "Orangemen,"¹ they attacked the Catholics and inflicted equally cruel atrocities upon them; while even the regular soldiers sent from England engaged in the murder, torture and arson which were everywhere prevalent.

To put an end to this reign of terror, and to prevent Ireland from becoming a base of operations for Napoleon and the French against England, the British prime minister, William Pitt, decided to unite Ireland politically with England, as Scotland had been united a century before (1707). He therefore secured control of the Irish parliament by means of bribery, and had both it and the British parliament pass the Act of Union, which went into operation January 1, 1801.

This act abolished the Irish parliament and provided that Ireland should be ruled by the British parliament, sitting at Westminster, in which Ireland should have thirty-two members of the House of Lords and one hundred members of the House of Commons. Not only was Ireland thus deprived of legislative independence or home rule, but the king, parliament and people of Great Britain refused for years to give to Irishmen religious liberty and political and economic equality. Hence, all through the Nineteenth Century, the Irish Question was one of the most difficult and dangerous with which England had to deal.

Political parties and leaders, associations of various kinds, violence in many forms, were all tried and tried in vain to settle Ireland's troubles. The government in England entered upon a policy of mingled kicks and kindness, suppress-

¹ In memory of the war between William of Orange and James II (See page 226).

ing Irishmen with ruthless severity, on one hand, and abolishing some of the grievances one by one on the other. When the World War loomed up, England was on the verge of granting complete Home Rule, and the Protestants in Ulster were on the verge of plunging into civil war to prevent an Irish parliament from ruling over them. To secure Ireland's aid in the great crisis, the government promised Home Rule when the war was ended, and the majority of Irishmen supported England in the war, sending many recruits to the British armies at the front. A minority believed that England's promise could not be trusted, and they desired moreover that Ireland should become entirely independent and that Ulster should be compelled to go with it. They therefore accepted the offer of German aid and started a rebellion in the midst of the war. This rebellion was speedily suppressed by the iron hand, and its leaders executed or imprisoned (1916).

After the World War had ended, Ulster still refused to share Ireland's fate, the British government still delayed to grant Home Rule, and there was constant brutal fighting, torture, retaliation, and ferocities of many kinds committed on both sides. Finally, in 1921, when the Washington Conference was striking at armaments, the cooler and wiser heads agreed that the old, old war-method was both ferocious and futile, and that the peace-method should be whole-heartedly applied. It was therefore agreed that Home Rule should be given to Ireland, that its parliament should be restored to it, and that it should become a practically self-governing "Free State" within the British Empire, like Canada or Australia.

The minority of Irishmen, who insisted on complete independence and the retention of Ulster (the Sinn Fein Party), kept up a fierce but losing fight; a general election was soon to be held, and by a large majority it was shown that opposition to the Free State had nearly died out. Ulster, too, though its hot-heads demanded war for the purpose of fixing the boundary-line between it and the Free State, soon

cooled down and agreed to the settlement of the boundary question by peaceful process.

Thus, after nine centuries of war, rebellion, persecution, coercion, violence and outrage, the peace-method has been given a fair chance, and it affords abundant promise of at last assuaging Ireland's woes and removing a cancerous spot from the body politic of the British Empire.

England's Civil Wars

During the centuries when England was struggling with Scotland, Wales and Ireland, endeavouring to create a union of all the British Isles, it was called upon to face also a long series of revolts and rebellions within its own boundaries. After Edward I had completed Henry II's solution of the problem of rebellious barons,¹ there were a number of minor revolts in order to reverse this settlement. Edward's son, Edward II, struggled for twenty years to defend his royal power against his barons, who were finally successful, with the aid of his wife and her paramour, in deposing and murdering him (1327).

Richard II, also, after a series of defeats and triumphs, was deposed by his rival, Henry IV, and murdered in prison (1399). Henry IV, having gained the throne by the sword, found it an uneasy one. Repeated conspiracies, aided by the Scotch, were launched against him (1400-08); and, although he died in possession of the throne, his son Henry V immediately faced another revolt; and after the suppression of it and the execution of its leaders, he renewed the Hundred Years' War with France, in an effort to quiet domestic dissension by winning foreign victories.

Henry V's son, Henry VI, though crowned king of both England and France, lost nearly all the English possessions in France, and lost his throne and his life in England. No sooner had the Hundred Years' War with France come to an end (1453), than England was engaged in that series of bloody and barbarous events known as the Wars of the

¹ See page 205.

Roses (1455-85). For thirty years, the rival houses of Lancaster and York kept England stirred up to its foundations, and inflicted upon it a thick crowd of battles and sieges, massacres and murders, pestilence, destruction and poverty. At least a dozen fierce battles in the field were fought, with Scotch, Irish and French allies fighting on one side or the other. First the Red Rose of Lancaster would be dominant, and hold possession of the throne; then the White Rose of York; and finally the Double Rose of Tudor, whose first wearer was the son of a Lancastrian father and a Yorkist mother! And in the midst of all this senseless slaughter and futile ferocity, William Caxton introduced the printing-press into England almost unnoticed (1471)! By it the pen was to be made indeed more powerful than the sword.

Naturally, after Henry Tudor had found his way through a sea of blood to the throne, he was not left at peace upon it. Two pretenders, Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck gave themselves out as Yorkist earl and duke, secured aid from Scotland and Ireland, and were defeated and suppressed at the Battles of Stoke (1487), Blackheath and Taunton (1497).

From time to time, during these civil wars and revolts precipitated by men or pretenders of high degree, there had occurred revolts among the common people. The first and worst of these was the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. The peasants of England, like those on the Continent, were at first serfs, bound to render service on the lands of their lords. Gradually, they had bought their "freedom," or the right to pay for the use of their lands by means of money or produce instead of by service. But when the great pestilence, or Black Death, which followed in the trail of the Hundred Years' War with France, had carried off many thousands of English peasants (more than one-half the entire population), the landlords could not get their own fields sown or their crops harvested; they therefore demanded that the parliament should pass laws (the Statutes

of Labourers) compelling the surviving peasants to work for them, and to work for them at wages no higher than prevailed before the Black Death (1348). These statutes were reenacted from year to year for a generation after the Black Death, and attempts were made to enforce them by increasingly severe penalties of flogging, imprisonment, branding and death.

Finally, the peasants rose in desperation; they captured the strongholds of their oppressors, burned the records which doomed them to serfdom, destroyed much other property, killed many lawyers and others whom they deemed responsible for their oppression, and raised an army of 100,000 to march upon the government at London. Here, they sacked and burned the homes of their oppressors and murdered many lawyers and others. But when the boy-king, Richard II, promised to be their leader, to abolish serfdom, and to give them signed and sealed charters of manumission, they dispersed to their homes. The landlords rallied, however, attacked and cut down the peasants singly or in scattered groups, hung many of their leaders, and induced the king and his council to revoke the charters of manumission and restore villein service.

This perfidy was not successful in perpetuating serfdom; for economic forces were too strong for violence, treachery and class-selfishness, and in the course of the next century brought about again, and this time to stay, the commutation of personal service into payments of money or produce. Thus, the English peasants were freed a century or more before their brethren on the continent of Europe; and never again did England witness a peasant outburst such as occurred in Germany in 1525 and in France in 1789.

Revolts against taxation, however, did occur. One of the immediate causes of the Peasants' Revolt was an unjust poll-tax, which compelled the poorest peasant to pay a tax for himself and all his children over the age of fifteen. When London fell into the peasants' hands, they beheaded the Archbishop of Canterbury who, as Chancellor, had pro-

posed the unjust tax for the payment of the expense incurred by the war against France and Scotland.

While villeinage was dying out, the landlords tried to meet the problem of cultivating their lands by converting them into pastures; and they also inclosed within fences for their own flocks a great deal of the land which belonged to the people in common. At the same time, their lands were left practically untaxed, so that the burden of taxation, as well as the weight of unemployment due to the inclosures, fell upon the poorer and landless classes. Against this economic condition as well as against misgovernment in general, a revolt broke out in the County of Kent, where 30,000 men flocked to the standard of Jack Cade (1450). London surrendered to the rebels again, as it had done in the days of the Peasants' Revolt. But Jack Cade could not control his followers, who proceeded to plunder, burn and execute, until the citizens of London turned against them, attacked them on London Bridge, and made a bargain with them to return to their homes on condition of a free pardon. Cade tried to recruit another army, but was captured and slain.

Cade's rebellion was the prelude to the Wars of the Roses,¹ and during these wars, in which the nobility were cutting one another to pieces and oppressing the whole nation with burdens, there were risings in various parts of England, the most formidable of which was led by William of Rydesdale. These rebels allied themselves with one of the Roses' armies and were crushed with the defeat of that army at Stamford, or Losecoat Field (1469).

After the Roses' Wars, the need of revenue caused the imposition of an oppressive tax, and this stirred up the partisans of the losing side to start a formidable revolt in the southwest. Many thousands of Cornishmen refused to pay the tax and marched on London. They were met on Blackheath by the king's forces, overpowered in a bloody battle, and saw their leaders executed (1497). Six thou-

¹ See pages 231-2.

sand of them soon after joined in Perkin Warbeck's revolt, and they too were dispersed and punished.

Taxation for military purposes caused another revolt in Henry VIII's reign (1523), when Wolsey demanded the raising of an enormous sum, equal to about \$60,000,000, to carry on a war with France. In the face of the revolt of both nobles and people which met this demand, the government withdrew it before much blood was shed. Soon afterwards, the representatives of the people themselves in the House of Commons gained firm control of the power to raise revenue by taxation; and by this constitutional and wholly rational device rebellions due to taxation subsided.

Civil wars due to religion (or to the lack of it) were not so frequent or so bitter in England as in countries on the Continent; but there have been a few of them. William of Normandy's invasion of England in 1066 was called a "Crusade" of the faithful Frenchmen against the unfaithful Englishmen; it was blessed by the pope, who sent a sacred banner to its leader. After the first battle, however, the conquest ceased to have much religious aspect, and became one of pure aggrandizement.

The Peasants' Revolt of 1381 was also due partly to an uprising of William Wyclif's followers, the Lollards, against the wealth, luxuriousness and tyranny of the clergy. Some of the "Poor Priests" whom Wyclif founded to preach his doctrines of reform became the leaders of the peasants; and one of them, John Ball, supplied the peasants with their slogan:

*"When Adam delved and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?"*

The Lollards were discredited by the peasants' resort to violence, and their opponents seized the opportunity of the popular reaction against them to pass a law providing for the burning of heretics (1401). Under this law the Lollards were hunted down and executed; and when in desperation they appealed to arms, they were defeated in St. Giles'

Fields and most of those who were captured were hung or burnt (1414). Their chief leader, Sir John Oldcastle, was soon afterwards captured and burnt, and for a time Lollardism was driven into a hunted and secret existence, chiefly in the towns.

But a century later, the Protestant Revolution, which was nourished partly by Lollardism and partly by Lutheranism, began in England. King Henry VIII, for private and political purposes of his own, broke with the papacy and asserted the royal supremacy over the Church of England (1534). This caused a rebellion of Henry's Catholic subjects, led by Robert Aske and some of the Catholic nobility. The rebellion was stamped out; but Henry's abolition of the monasteries and other attacks upon the old Catholic Church led to several other incipient revolts.

In the reign of his daughter, Mary, an attempt was made, with the aid of Mary's husband, the king of Spain, to stamp out Protestantism and restore Catholicism by burning, beheading and hanging the Protestant heretics. The two-fold Catholic and Spanish policy of "Bloody Mary" caused a revolt, led by Sir Thomas Wyatt, in favour of placing Lady Jane Grey, or Mary's sister Elizabeth, upon the throne. Wyatt and his army reached the walls of London; but Lady Jane's noble adherents did not live up to their agreement with Wyatt, his army was defeated in Hyde Park, and he, Lady Jane and many others were beheaded (1553-4).

This Protestant revolt against Mary was followed by Catholic conspiracies and revolts against Elizabeth (1583-8). The object of these was to kill or depose Elizabeth and place Mary Stuart on England's throne. They were all detected and suppressed, by executions more than by battle, Mary Stuart and many other of the conspirators suffering death on the scaffold; but they finally culminated in a war with Catholic Spain (1588-1604).

Before this war came to an end, Elizabeth was succeeded by Mary Stuart's son James, who, as James VI of Scotland, had been brought up as a Presbyterian and now, as

James I of England, became an Episcopalian. His Catholic subjects in England endeavoured to replace him on the throne, first by his cousin, Arabella Stuart (1603), and then by his daughter, Elizabeth (1605). Some of them joined in the Gunpowder Plot of Guy Fawkes to blow up the royal family and both houses of Parliament with thirty-six barrels of gunpowder placed in a cellar of the parliament house. This plot was also discovered and many of the conspirators were executed.

James' son, Charles I, had more than plots and local outbursts to contend with; for he was called upon to face two Civil Wars (1642-6 and 1648). Charles' attacks upon the Puritans and upon the power of Parliament, and Parliament's attacks upon Episcopacy and the power of the king, were the religious and political causes of these civil wars, which are known in history as the Great Rebellion.

The two Bishops' Wars against Scotland¹ and the Irish Massacre² were the prelude to the Rebellion in England; and both Scotland and Ireland were involved in the civil wars in England and were themselves conquered by the English rebels. Some twenty bloody battles were fought in these wars in England alone, besides those fought in Scotland and Ireland; and many towns and cities were besieged and captured by one side or the other, some of them sustaining two or more sieges and assaults. In the most serious of these conflicts, such as the battles of Marston Moor, Naseby, the three days' battle of Preston Pans, and the final battle of Worcester, many hundreds of soldiers were slain. But history affords us no record of the thousands whom war, pestilence and famine swept off in this attempt to settle religious and constitutional questions by irreligious and unconstitutional means.

After the bloodshed of twenty years, and after only a dozen years of existence and of constant struggle between the parliament and Cromwell's army, the victors' government was overthrown and the Stuart kings were restored to

¹ See page 213.

² See page 225.

the throne (1660). This restoration, like their deposition, was accomplished by an army whose leader, General Monk, defied the old army, and recalled the son of the beheaded king. Some of the king's opponents made one last desperate effort in the streets of London to keep him out, but were attacked, hunted, seized, and slain or deported (1661). Most fortunately, Cromwell's old army of "Ironsides" had had enough of bloodshed, and peaceably laid down their arms, retiring to their farms and former occupations; while the new monarch, Charles II, had sense or indifference enough not to execute many of their leaders.

The restored Stuart kings, however, were not to be left unmolested on their English, Scottish and Irish thrones. An imaginary attack upon the king and Protestantism, known as the "Popish Plot," embroiled the kingdom for a half-dozen years (1678-83). Two real plots, known as the "Meal-tub Plot" and the "Rye House Plot," were discovered and suppressed without much bloodshed. Then Charles II's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth, attempted first to exclude his uncle James from the throne, and after James' accession to overthrow him (1685). Coming from Holland with a small army of supporters, Monmouth rallied a force of 60,000 Englishmen who were opposed to James' government and his attempt to restore Catholicism; with these, he marched through the southwest toward London, but got only as far as Sedgemoor, where James' army met and defeated him in a bloody battle, which was made all the bloodier by a ruthless pursuit and massacre of the fugitive soldiers and a ruthless execution of many civilians who had sympathized with the rebellion. (*The Bloody Assizes of Judge Jeffreys*, 1685).

Sedgemoor was the last battle fought on England's soil; but three years later there occurred what is called "The Great and Glorious Revolution," in which James II was deposed, William III of Orange was elected king, and parliament finally secured its supremacy over the crown. Although both James and William relied upon armies which

they gathered together, there was no battle in this "bloodless" revolution; for the English nation was almost a unit against James; his army went over to the side of William, and the only man killed in the course of the revolution was run over by an artillery-wagon. Thus, a revolution which was far more effective and permanent than its predecessors was carried through without the immense loss of life and property which had accompanied them. Such is the power of an enlightened, aroused and organized public opinion!

The Stuarts tried to regain the throne on several later occasions. During the War of the Spanish Succession, when Louis XIV of France was warring against Europe, the French supplied a fleet to James II's son, "the Old Pretender," for the purpose of invading England from Scotland. But the fleet was repulsed in a battle with the English, and the Old Pretender retired to France (1708).

Seven years later, when the first Hanoverian was ascending England's throne, the Old Pretender made another attempt. His supporters in Scotland proclaimed him king, and marched against the English troops in Scotland who defeated them in the battles of Sheriffmuir and Preston Pans (1715). Once more, a generation later, the Stuarts made an attempt on England by way of Scotland (1745-6). This time "the Young Pretender," Prince Charlie, landed in Scotland, was received in Edinburgh, defeated the government troops at Preston Pans, marched into England as far as Derby (when he was obliged to retreat), won two more minor victories at Penrith and Falkirk Moor, and was then totally defeated at Culloden. His Scotch troops were slaughtered during this battle and afterwards, and about forty of the leading rebels were executed, while Charles himself escaped to France, to lead a dissolute life and die a shameful death.

No other royal rival has made an attempt on the English throne; nor have there been any more religious wars or political rebellions. During the French Revolution, when the British government was engaged in war with France

and endeavouring to prevent the spread of revolutionary principles in England by suppressing freedom of speech and freedom of the press, a violent revolt was very narrowly avoided. Fortunately, British juries refused to inflict the death-penalty and to execute the most drastic of the laws against the advocates of a republic and of liberty in all its forms. Hence, the dissatisfied elements refrained from resorting to the war-method, and settled down to achieving their objects by constitutional means. This they accomplished in the Nineteenth Century, through the Reform Acts of 1832, 1867 and 1885, and other liberal legislation. Thus, liberty and law once more triumphed over war.

The Industrial Revolution came early in England and was carried through so swiftly as to bring many terrible hardships and miseries to the working-classes. At first, the labourers tried to remedy their ills by resorting to the destruction of machinery, the burning of factories, and other forms of violence. At one time, their grievances appeared so unendurable that 50,000 of them met on St. Peter's Field in Manchester to discuss the proper remedy (1819). The government knew only one way to cope with this situation, and that was by force. Its soldiers had broken up many smaller meetings; and against this huge meeting also, it sent companies of yeomanry and hussars. The resulting panic, wounds and deaths are known collectively as the "Manchester Massacre," and the government's victory over its own people was ridiculed as the "Peterloo" victory to contrast it with the victory of "Waterloo" over the Napoleonic despot. Fortunately, England had less stupid and prejudiced leaders than those responsible for the attempt to settle industrial disputes by means of armed force; and under their leadership a long series of factory acts and other reform measures were carried through parliament and applied to the industrial problem, with the result of preventing civil war, of mitigating at least the hardships of the poor, and of securing comparative justice to the labouring class. So far has this peaceful revolution gone that a Labour

Party and a Labour prime minister and cabinet are now in beneficent control of England's government.

England's Wars with France

Throughout these centuries of civil strife and wars with Scotland, Wales and Ireland, England had continued its warfare on the continent of Europe and beyond the seas. This warfare was chiefly with France; and as a prelude to it, came England's participation in the Crusades.

Its share in the Crusades was less than that of France or Germany; but many hundreds of Englishmen took part in expeditions to the Holy Land which were not led by England's sovereigns. The first of the English kings to lead a crusade was Richard I, who tried with Philip II of France and Frederick I of Germany to recapture Jerusalem in the Third Crusade (1190-92). Romantic legends of the prowess and achievements of "Richard of the Lion's Heart" have come down through the centuries and helped to glorify the bestial business of war; but the true story is a very sordid one of jealousy, quarrels and war between the rival Christian kings, their military inferiority to Saladin and his Saracens, their failure to recapture or even look upon Jerusalem, Richard's captivity by a Christian enemy, and the enormous ransom which his English subjects had to pay for his release. While back of all this, and wholly incapable of adequate estimate or appreciation are the sufferings of the Saracens, the loss of English blood and treasure, and the lowering of English standards of morality and religion. This last tragic result of the preceding century of crusading ardour was evident, among other things, from the extortions and cruelties practised against the Jews and the terrible massacre of them in York and many other towns (1190-1), on the eve of the crusaders' marching forth "to free from impious hands the sepulchre of Christ."

Not until the last crusade (1270), did another English sovereign participate in the effort to recapture the Holy Land. When Louis IX of France was making his last, un-

successful effort to break the Moslem power at Tunis, Edward of England, then Prince but soon to become King Edward I, was leading an army of Englishmen to and fro in Syria, without accomplishing any result of importance or permanence, except to the Englishmen whose lives were sacrificed in his wild-goose chase.

The military contacts between England and France began just before the First Crusade, and have continued with but comparatively few gaps during the eight centuries that followed. During the fourteen preceding centuries, as we have seen,¹ the various inhabitants of the two lands had been engaged in war with one another from time to time.

William, Duke of Normandy, was a menace to the French king's power, both before and after his conquest of England (1066). As king of England, he incited other French barons to rebellion against their king, and had to struggle with the rebellions of his own barons which were aided by the king of France. Finally, he met his death during a war with Philip I over the possession of a French district, known as the Vexin. Having set fire to the town of Mantes, he rode on horseback into its ashes, and was thrown so violently by his shying horse upon the pommel of his saddle that he died a few days afterwards (1087). The grave in which his body was buried had to be bought from a knight from whose father William had robbed it. It is characteristic of the "history" of the past that such incidents as these occurring to captains and to kings should be handed down across the centuries, while the statistics of deaths and wounds, the record of burning towns and the manifold miseries caused by war to the silent multitudes, should be unsought for, ignored, or concealed by a cloak of false glamour and "glory."

We have seen how, during the long struggle between the English kings and their rebellious sons and barons, the French kings rendered aid to the rebels, in the hope of expelling the English kings and barons from the lands which

¹ See page 195.

they ruled in France. This was notably the case during the reign of Henry II when, first his eldest son Henry, and then his sons Richard and John, led rebellions of the barons, aided by the kings of France, against their father (1173 and 1189).

Henry II died in humiliation and defeat in this last rebellion; but Richard and John, having received aid from the French king when they were rebels, found that same king an implacable foe when they themselves ascended the English throne. The reason for this, of course, was the unnatural union of lands and peoples in both England and France which the English kings strove to maintain, and the determination of the French kings to unite all the lands of France under their own sceptre.

Richard, on his return from the Third Crusade, spent the rest of his reign in France, fighting with Philip II in defense of his French possessions (1194-99). His brother John inherited the struggle, and was unsuccessful in it. His moral condemnation for the murder of his nephew, Arthur of Brittany, who ruled over much of the French territory, resulted in his own loss of Normandy and of most of the other French lands (1203-4). Ten years later, he formed an alliance with the German emperor against Philip II; but his allies were defeated in the Battle of Bouvines (1214), and John failed in his expedition to southern France.

Philip followed up this victory by sending his son with a fleet and army to annex England to France, as William the Conqueror had annexed it (for a time) to Normandy. But John had been compelled to grant Magna Charta to the English people (1215), and they preferred to bulwark their liberties under this great constitutional document, rather than accept a foreign king. John died during the French invasion, and the guardians of his young son Henry defeated the French army at Lincoln and the French fleet off Dover, thus compelling the French king to relinquish his design (1217).

But the English kings still held lands in southern France, and there was much rivalry and sporadic warfare between the English and French fishermen and mariners in the English Channel, this latter warfare culminating in a naval battle of considerable magnitude (1293). Hence, when war soon afterwards broke out between England and Scotland, France became Scotland's ally, and regular war began between England and France (1294). But the English barons refused to follow King Edward I to fight in France until they had restricted his power in the government of England, and then they fought half-heartedly; while the rising of the Scotch people under Wallace made the conquest of Scotland so difficult that Edward made peace with France (1303), and tried to make this peace a permanent one by betrothing his son to the daughter of the French king, whose sister Isabella he himself had previously married.

But royal marriages were not so potent as was royal ambition. The first two Edwards had their hands full in trying to conquer Scotland; and it was not until this proved impossible, that the third Edward renewed the war with France. This period of the centuries-long strife is known as the Hundred Years' War, although it lasted with intervals over a period of a hundred and sixteen years (1337-1453). The fundamental cause of this war was the old rivalry between the kings of England and France for the domination of the lands and people in southern France;¹ but to this were added: maritime rivalry; the alliances of France with Scotland, and of England with Flanders and Brittany; and the claim put forward by the English kings to be recognized as the lawful kings of France because of their descent from the French princess Isabella and her father, Philip IV.

¹ These lands and people were not yet "French," strictly speaking, either linguistically, politically, or racially; and they were not given a chance by either side to say under which allegiance they preferred to live.

Early in the war, the English and their Flemish allies won a victory at Sluys over the French fleet (1340); and after the English army's victory over the French at Crécy (1346), they captured the seaport of Calais (1347). This enabled them to use Calais as a base of operations, and to confine the war to France. France thus suffered the chief burden of battles and sieges, devastations and disease. The English won another "famous victory" at Poitiers (1356) which, like that at Crécy, was a triumph of archers over knights, of foot-soldiers over cavalry, of common people over chivalry. But famous victories could not win the war; and meanwhile, in the very year of the victory at Crécy, the Black Death came to England in the footsteps of the soldiers returning from France, and from one-half to two-thirds of England's population was swept away by this dread disease (1346-69).

The Black Death afflicted France as well, and civil war and peasants' revolts were added to her woes, while Scotland continued to war upon England. The two sovereigns therefore decided to make peace (at Bretigny, 1360), the English king agreeing to surrender for himself and his successors his claim to the French throne, while retaining in full sovereignty a large part of the lands in southern France.

But this "perpetual peace" was only a short truce. A few years later (1366), English and French armies were arrayed against each other in a struggle between two Spanish princes for the throne of Spain. The French protégé was at first triumphant, and his brother was expelled; then the English defeated the French army (at Najara, 1367), and the English protégé was replaced on the throne. He was soon afterwards defeated by his brother and murdered by his exasperated subjects as a tyrant and fiend; his "victorious" English champion, Edward, the Black Prince, lost four-fifths of his army, and himself contracted fever in the Spanish campaign and died a few years later (1376).

Meanwhile, the war between the English and French had

been renewed (1369). The Black Prince, as governor of the English lands in southern France, had alienated the inhabitants of the towns by levying taxes upon them for the purpose of paying his soldiers, and they opened their gates to French garrisons. Edward recaptured some of these towns, and killed many of the citizens along with the garrison; at Limoges, for example, he butchered more than 3,000 men, women and children on a single day. Froissart, the contemporary chronicler who records this atrocity, has made far more famous than this massacre the acts of "chivalry" achieved by this same Black Prince, such as his waiting at table behind a French *king* captured by him in the Battle of Poitiers, and the mercy shown by him at this very town of Limoges to three "gentlemen" who had fought fiercely to "sell their lives as dearly as possible."

How strangely distorted is the popular idea of "history" when the Black Prince should be so familiar to the average reader while, for example, his contemporary, William Langland, should be known by comparatively few! And yet it was Langland who emphasized in his poem of "Piers Plowman" the true worth and dignity of honest toil, and turned from kings and "gentlemen" to the simple-hearted peasant, in his search for a cure of the manifold ills of that age of chivalry. More honour is it to England, and more important was it to the world, to have produced such a man and such an ideal than to have won the famous victories of Crécy and Poitiers.

Charles V, "the Wise," of France, and his general, Du Guesclin, wore the English out by guerilla warfare and recapture of the towns. The Black Prince's successor lost an army in a fruitless march across France, and the truce which followed left only Calais and four other French seaports in English hands. The Black Prince's son, Richard II, had his hands so full with the Peasants' Revolt and barons' turbulence that he prolonged the truce and married the French king's daughter.

Henry IV, who supplanted Richard II on the throne, had

his hands full with a succession of revolts in England; but his son Henry V, in order to carry off restless elements and crush dissatisfaction, especially of the Lollards, renewed the French war before the twenty-six years' truce was ended (1415). After failing to capture the seaport of Harfleur, Henry retreated with his army of 10,000 toward Calais, but was overtaken by a French army of 50,000 at Agincourt. Here he won another "famous victory,"—the most famous of them all, perhaps; but its practical result was merely to enable him to escape with the remnant of his army to England, while the victory itself was stained by a slaughter of the thousands of Frenchmen who had been taken prisoner (1415).¹

France, during these years, was in the throes of a savage civil war, and Henry pursued his opportunity, made an alliance with the Burgundian rebels in France, and started on another expedition (1417). The towns of Normandy surrendered or were taken one after the other,—Henry ordering a terrible massacre of soldiers and citizens at Caen, as a warning to others not to resist. The Norman capital, Rouen, did not heed the warning, and Henry laid siege to the city. Food grew scarce; the French garrison drove the poorer citizens outside the wall; Henry would not permit them to pass through his lines; for five months they starved and died day by day, cooped up between the city walls and the English army and begging food from both; ² until famine carried them all off and compelled the city itself to surrender (January, 1419).

But civil war was an even worse foe to the French than were the English. In the course of it, the Duke of Burgundy was murdered in an interview with the Dauphin of France, who was acting as regent for his insane father.

¹ This was due either to Henry's belief that a gang of French plunderers who had attacked Henry's baggage was a fresh army sent against him, or to his desire to be unencumbered by prisoners on his further retreat to Calais.

² On Christmas Day (1418), Henry observed the birthday of the Christ by sending food to the few wretches who were left!

Thereupon, all parties in France turned against the Dauphin and made peace with the English (at Troyes, 1420), disinheriting the Dauphin, giving his sister in marriage to Henry, and agreeing that as soon as the insane Charles VI should die Henry should succeed him on the throne of France. But before he could wear the dual crown of England and France, Henry died, and Charles VI followed a few weeks later to his grave (1422).

The son of Henry V and his French queen was left an infant of nine months when Henry died, and during his long minority his uncles did what they could to achieve the impossible task of annexing France to England. The north and east of France recognized the infant Henry VI as their king, in accordance with the treaty of Troyes; but the south and west recognized the former Dauphin, now Charles VII. For a half-dozen years, the English fought, gaining some minor victories, but failing to capture Orleans, the key to the south and west. And then arose Joan of Arc, the French peasant-girl, whose faith in her mission "to crown the Dauphin" was shared by the impressionable and almost despairing Frenchmen of the south. Her brief career of victory, her apparent failure, and her tragic death have been recounted elsewhere.¹

The chief result of Joan's career was to inspire the French in all parts of France with a feeling of nationality; now, for the first time, they really felt themselves to be of the same nation, totally different from the foreign Englishmen. This caused the end of the civil war between the adherents of the Dauphin and the Burgundians, who united against the common foe. The bad government in England, popular dissatisfaction which led up to Jack Cade's Rebellion (1450),² and the growing conviction of the people that the conquest of France was unnatural and impossible and that the century of warfare was a senseless drain on English blood and treasure, caused the war to be pursued in a half-hearted and inefficient manner. For twenty years after

¹ See pages 171-2.

² See page 234.

Joan's death, it languished on, with some fluctuations of fortune, and finally came to a tacit end, without a formal treaty of peace, and with the English driven or withdrawn from all French territory, except the city of Calais (1453).

Thus to an inglorious end came the wild and wicked dream which had been cherished by English sovereigns from time to time for three hundred years, of creating a British Empire of the West, including the British Isles and France, and rivalling the Holy Roman Empire of the German People. It was two centuries later before the British and French again clashed in the mighty warfare of empire;¹ but meanwhile, the two peoples engaged in a dozen or more wars of minor scope and meaner purpose.

During the civil war of the Roses (1462), the French sent aid to Henry VI of Lancaster, the son of a French mother and husband of a French queen, who had himself been acknowledged in his childhood as king of France. The French aid was unavailing, and Henry died in the Tower, the victim of a Yorkist assassin (1471). Edward IV, the Yorkist claimant, invaded France by way of retaliation; but although Burgundy again became England's ally against the French, Edward accomplished nothing and made peace without a battle (1475). The peace provided that France should pay a large indemnity to England, and that the Dauphin should marry Edward's daughter. The French king broke this promise, and Edward was on the eve of another invasion of France when he came to a sudden death (1483).

When Henry VII of Lancaster and Tudor succeeded the Yorkists, the Yorkist Duchess of Burgundy tried to send Burgundian and French aid to Perkin Warbeck who pretended to be a Duke of York and started a rising against Henry; but Henry made a commercial treaty profitable to Burgundian trade, and thus prevented the proposed invasion (1496).

Henry VII had made an alliance with Spain and Ger-

¹ See page 265.

many to prevent the French king from annexing Brittany; and in the year in which Columbus discovered America,—*without* Henry's aid,—he led an army across the Channel to invade France. But the French king paid his enemies a sum of money, married the Duchess of Brittany, and secured the duchy (1492). This failure in continental politics did not prevent Henry's son, Henry VIII, from entering into an alliance with the pope, Spain, Germany and Venice to prevent France from conquering northern Italy (1511-13). An English army was sent to coöperate with the Spaniards in attacking France across the Pyrenees; but the English troops mutinied and the Spanish government failed to support the expedition, so that Henry gained nothing from this war except the title of "Most Christian King," which was conferred upon him by the pope. He then led an army himself to Calais and, coöperating with the Germans, defeated the French at Guinegate (the Battle of the Spurs), and took several French towns. As usual, war with France led to war with Scotland; and, also as usual, Henry's European allies were intent only on their own selfish interests,—as was Henry himself. He therefore made peace again with France, and gave to the old French king as wife his young sister Mary, who was a most reluctant bride.

Again war with France loomed up when Francis I and the Habsburgs were engaged in their life and death struggle.¹ For a time, Henry's minister, Cardinal Wolsey, prevailed upon his king to preserve the peace and to squander his money, not for the glory of war, but in the rivalry of display on the "Field of the Cloth of Gold" (1520). But Henry's craving for "glory" was not to be satisfied with mere extravagance of display; so he allied himself with the Habsburgs, invaded France, burned and ravaged, and then came home to ask parliament for more money to help him secure for himself the crown of France (1522). But parliament was tired of this foolishness, and when Henry in-

¹ See pages 159-162.

vaded France again the next year with his German allies, he did so with inadequate resources and accomplished only about as much destruction as before (1523). Two years later, Henry again tried to wring money from his English taxpayers to pursue his ambition in France; but parliament and people showed strong signs of rebellion, and Henry subsided as far as war on the continent was concerned (1525).

He then turned his energies to breaking with the papacy, asserting his own supremacy over the Church of England, marrying a succession of wives, and carrying on wars with Ireland and Scotland. This last war led to another with France, Scotland's old ally. Again allying himself with the Germans, Henry invaded France, and captured the seaport of Boulogne after a long and costly siege (1544). England's ally, meanwhile, made peace with France; and Henry also, after he had relinquished Boulogne and turned his destructive fury upon Scotland, made peace with France (1546), a few months before he was called upon to make peace with God.

Henry's daughter Mary was drawn by her Spanish husband into another war with France (1557-8), in which, after a defeat of the French army at St. Quentin (the English troops arriving too late to take part in the battle), the English garrison was obliged to surrender Calais and to lose with it every foot of French soil which they had so long possessed. "Calais" was the word which Mary said would be found engraved upon her broken heart; but "Repentance," for war and the burning of Protestants, would have been a more appropriate password to the other world which she was called upon to enter within a year after she lost the rest of England's possessions in France.

Henry's other daughter, Elizabeth, planned to regain Calais by aiding the Huguenots, who were engaged in the religious wars in France. She received from her Huguenot allies the seaport of Havre, which she hoped to exchange for Calais. But the allies were defeated in the Battle of

Dreux; and a pestilence attacked the English garrison at Havre, drove those who survived back to England, and compelled Elizabeth to make peace with France without recovering Calais (1562-4).

Elizabeth was engaged during the rest of her reign in a war with Spain, and France drank its fill of the blood which flowed in the Wars of Religion; so that it was not until the time of Charles I and Richelieu that the two countries were again engaged in war (1626-30). Although France, under Richelieu's rule, was soon to send effective aid to the Protestants of Germany in the Thirty Years' War, Richelieu first determined to suppress Protestantism in France. He therefore attacked the Huguenot seaport, La Rochelle, and procured from Charles I the loan of some English ships to prosecute the siege. Charles' Protestant parliament, however, which was struggling also for political liberty, soon compelled him to reverse this policy and send aid to the Huguenots. The king's favorite, the Duke of Buckingham, sailed with an army on board a hundred ships to La Rochelle, but was defeated by Richelieu, and returned to England, having lost some 4,000 of his 6,800 troops. Another expedition was fitted out by arbitrary taxation (which was soon to precipitate the Civil War in England itself); but Buckingham was murdered on the eve of its departure, and his successor failed utterly to relieve La Rochelle, which was soon surrendered to Richelieu, and Protestantism in France was finally stamped out.

During the Civil Wars in England (1642-49), France intrigued first with the Anglican king against the Puritan parliament, and then with the Presbyterians against Cromwell the Independent; but it supplied no effective aid to either, as it was busily engaged at the time in helping the German Protestants and acquiring as much German territory as possible. When Cromwell triumphed, he first offered to make an alliance with Spain against France, on condition of receiving the town of Dunkirk which he hoped to exchange for Calais; but the Spanish were unwilling to

grant the further condition that the English should have freedom of commerce and religion in the Spanish dominions. Cromwell therefore made an alliance with France, which was at war with Spain, on condition that Dunkirk was to be taken from the Spanish by a Franco-English force and given to England, and that freedom of religion was to be given Englishmen in France.

In the war which followed, the allies defeated the Spanish army in a decisive battle on the Dunes and captured several towns in the Spanish Netherlands, including Dunkirk, which was handed over to the English (1657-8). Cromwell soon afterwards died, and when Charles II came to the throne he promptly sold Dunkirk to the French for £200,000, thereby saving £120,000 per annum in addition, the cost of maintaining a garrison in the city.

But these friendly relations with France were to be short lived; for they were only an interlude in the old historic struggle which was soon to be renewed in a more intense and destructive form than ever before in the quest of imperial power. They had been made possible, indeed, only because of the success of Spain in claiming empire beyond the seas; for France and England had drawn together only to check Spain's imperial power, and when that danger had passed they renewed their own quarrel and rivalry.

The British Empire

England's rivals for imperial power in modern times included Spain, Holland, the Baltic Powers, France, Russia and Germany; and with each of these rivals she has waged gigantic or long continued wars.

Modern Spain dates from about the time of the Discovery of America (1492). The king of Aragon and the queen of Castile had married, a few years before, and united their realms to form the Spanish kingdom; and in the year of Columbus' voyage, the centuries-old struggle with the Moors ended with the fall of Granada. Immediately, Spain was recognized as a "great power" and one which

would be of great use in the wars of England, France and Germany. Repeatedly, as we have seen, in the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary, England made alliances with Spain in wars upon France. But in Elizabeth's time, Spain had grown into a power so formidable to Protestantism, to parliamentary government, and to any other imperial power beyond the oceans, that the English were forced to change their centuries-old, anti-French policy, and for a hundred years to come they battled against their new European enemy and chief American rival, the government of Spain.

The rebellion of the Dutch Protestants against their Spanish rulers, and the Eighty Years' War which they carried on against them (1568-1648), gave England its first good chance to strike a blow, not only for Protestantism and self-government, but also for a share in American trade and settlement. Thousands of Englishmen volunteered to fight in the Dutch armies, or were already capturing Spanish merchant ships, smuggling slaves and goods into Spanish America, and fighting naval battles with Spanish men-of-war, for a dozen years or so before the English government itself participated in the war. Finally, Elizabeth sent a fleet and army to the aid of the Dutch (1585); but she appointed as the leader of the expedition her favourite, the incompetent Leicester, and contributed no money toward its maintenance, so that it was a military failure.

Philip II of Spain then determined to attack England itself,—the nest of Protestant heretics, Atlantic pirates, and recruits to the Dutch rebels. After Mary Stuart's execution, he claimed the crown of England, on the plea that he was descended from an English princess, and prepared an immense expedition to make good his claim. Before this fleet sailed, Drake attacked the Spanish ports and burnt the store-ships of the Fleet, thereby "singeing the king of Spain's beard," as he proudly boasted (1587). The next year, the "Invincible Armada" did arrive off the coast of England, on its way to Holland to take on board the army

of Spanish veterans there and transport them to England. But the English navy attacked and harassed the Armada as it was sailing up the Channel, the Dutch navy blockaded the Spanish army in Flanders, and a great tempest destroyed the Spanish fleet and strewed the coasts of Scotland with its wrecks. Of 120 great ships which had begun the expedition, only 54 returned. No wonder that Elizabeth struck a commemorative medal with the inscription, "God blew with His wind and they were scattered"; or that Philip should have exclaimed, "I sent you to fight against men, and not with the winds."

England's historians in telling this story, have naturally stressed the bravery and skill of the English seamen; while this is undoubted, it neglects the Spanish side of the story which shows equal bravery on the part of their seamen, but gross ignorance and inefficiency on the part of their rulers. Perhaps the most just epitaph for the Invincible Armada is contained in Elizabeth's inscription cited above, or in Byron's lines:

*"Roll on, thou deep and dark blue Ocean,—roll!
Ten thousand fleets sweep over thee in vain;
Man marks the earth with ruin,—his control
Stops with the shore; upon the watery plain
The wrecks are all thy deed, nor doth remain
A shadow of man's ravage, save his own,
When, for a moment, like a drop of rain,
He sinks into thy depths with bubbling groan
Without a grave, unknelled, unconfined, and unknown.*

* * * *

*The armaments which thunderstrike the walls
Of rock-built cities, bidding nations quake
And monarchs tremble in their capitals,
The oak leviathans, whose huge ribs make
Their clay creator the vain title take
Of lord of thee and arbiter of war,—
These are thy toys, and, as the snowy flake,
They melt into thy yeast of waves, which mar
Alike the Armada's pride or spoils of Trafalgar."*

The war did not end with the sinking of the thousands

of brave men who manned the Armada. Drake, Raleigh and other English admirals captured, burned and sacked the Spanish cities of Corunna and Cadiz (1592, 1595); but they failed in an attack on Lisbon, and could not hope to conquer Spain, even in such a Hundred Years' War as had been fought against France. They had on hand, also, many other troubles, including the conquest of Ireland, to whose aid Spain at one time sent an unavailing fleet and army (1601).

Elizabeth's successor, James I, who was called "the wisest fool in Christendom," had wisdom enough to put an end to the folly of the Spanish war (1604); but he was fool enough, first to permit Raleigh to renew his attempt to find an Eldorado in Spanish America, and then to put him to death for having attacked and burned a Spanish town in the attempt (1618).

James was also desirous of marrying his son to a Spanish infanta, chiefly for the purpose of securing the large dowry which would come with her. The Prince of Wales was sent to Spain to woo the infanta; but she refused to marry a heretic, and the Spanish king would promise to favour the prince's suit only on condition that religious liberty should be given to English Catholics. The prince thereupon returned indignantly to England, and demanded that the war against Spain should be renewed. Since this war would help the Protestants in Holland and those in Germany, against whom Spain and Austria were fighting at the time, the English parliament appropriated money for carrying it on. James was still for peace and alliance with Spain; but he died soon after Prince Charles' return, and Charles and his favourite, the Duke of Buckingham, pushed on the war (1625-30).

A great expedition of ships and soldiers, comparable indeed to the Invincible Armada, was equipped and sent to capture Cadiz and the fleet of Spanish treasure-ships which annually entered it from America. The English sailors and soldiers were pressed by force into this expedition, and went

upon it half-heartedly; and when they were landed outside of Cadiz to take the city, they all got drunk on Spanish wines, and had to be reëmbarked before the Spaniards should sally forth from the city and capture them! Thus Cadiz was not taken, and the treasure-fleet got safely into port while the English fleet was looking for it on the ocean, so that the great expedition was a complete failure. Not wind, as in the Spanish Armada's case, but wine was the English Armada's undoing.

A war with France, Buckingham's murder, and the rise of the Civil Wars in England, soon put an end to this war with Spain (1630).

After the Civil Wars, Cromwell proposed an alliance with Spain against France, as we have seen; ¹ but when he found that he could make better terms with France, he made an alliance with France against Spain (1654). In the war that followed, an English fleet failed to capture the Spanish island of San Domingo, but did capture Jamaica, which has since become one of England's chief island possessions.²

The War of the Spanish Succession (1701-14), in which Spain was involved as an ally of France, has been recorded elsewhere.³ As an ally of France, it gladly accepted a French Bourbon king, in defiance of England and the rest of Europe, and became a bloody battle-ground for English and Austrian troops fighting desperately against Spanish and French defenders of a French king on Spanish soil. But within three years after the close of this terrible war, Spain found herself confronted by France and England, who were allied with others to prevent Spain from regaining her lost possessions in Italy. An English fleet destroyed the Spanish one (1718), a Spanish expedition to Scotland in aid of the Stuart Pretenders failed, and Spain gave up her Italian conquests.

¹ Page 253.

² As a reward for this service, Admiral Penn's Quaker pacifist son, William, received the grant of Pennsylvania.

³ Pages 89, 163-4.

Spain's power had long since been sapped by militarism and autocracy, and Englishmen discovered soon after Elizabeth's time that in fighting it they were fighting a colossus of clay, or huge man of straw. As a monopolist of the New World, or as a maritime and imperial rival of England, Spain soon gave way to others. During the War of the Spanish Succession, however, an English fleet had captured the Spanish seaport of Gibraltar (1704), and England had insisted on retaining this stronghold when peace was made. It has retained it ever since; and as it is not only "the key to the Mediterranean," but also a menacing base of operation on Spanish soil against Spain itself, the Spaniards have naturally been extremely anxious to regain it from England by purchase or by force.

This desire for Gibraltar, together with England's insistence on trading with Spanish America, either by treaty or by smuggling, led to several more wars between the two countries in the Eighteenth Century. The War of Jenkins's Ear (1739-48), in which English fleets captured Spanish treasure-ships and Porto Bello in Spanish America, emphasized Spain's conviction that she would lose all her American colonies to England unless she allied herself closely with France and offered a united resistance. In the Seven Years' or French and Indian War (1755-63), however, in which France lost her American possessions to England, Spain did not enter until too late to be of much aid (1762); and then one English fleet captured Cuba, another captured Manila, in the Philippines, another took Minorca, in the Mediterranean, and all together swept Spanish commerce from the seas. At the peace which ended the war, Spain regained these lost possessions, but ceded Florida to England in exchange for Louisiana which had been taken from France.

Again, when France made an alliance with the Americans in the American Revolution (February, 1778), Spain also joined in rather tardily (June, 1779). In this war, the Spaniards recaptured Minorca, but failed in their des-

perate and costly attempts to recapture Gibraltar, for the possession of which they prevailed upon the French and Americans to prolong the war for some time after the other combatants would have made peace.

Once again, in the French Revolutionary War, the Spanish king overcame his antipathy to the new French republic, through his desire to regain Gibraltar, and again allied Spain with France (1796). The Spanish fleet tried to unite with the French fleet, to launch an attack upon England; but it was overwhelmed by the British off Cape St. Vincent (1797).

Napoleon also utilized another Spanish fleet in his effort to invade England, and at Trafalgar (1805), this fleet as well as that of France was sunk beneath the waves. Napoleon knew no gratitude, however, and desiring to annex Spain to France by placing his brother Joseph on the throne, threw the Spanish people into England's arms. A century before they had fought against England desperately to retain their French Bourbon king, and now they fought desperately with England against a French Bonaparte sovereign.¹ The British army and fleet coöperated with the Spanish people in driving the French out of Spain, and in attacking southern France in the overthrow of Napoleon (1814). Here again was it true that war is a game at which, were the people wise, kings would not play.

Now England, having helped to overthrow the Napoleonic despotism in Spain, assented to the return of the Bourbons, under whom despotism of another and even worse kind was restored. In the fierce outburst of the Spanish people (in 1820-21) to get rid of this new despotism, it is to England's credit that she did not join with the Holy Alliance and France in compelling Spain to restore its despots to the throne. During the civil war of the Carlists (1833-39), the English government did permit a British legion of 10,000 to be enlisted for the support of the Constitutionalists, and they participated in the terribly cruel and

¹ See pages 90, 181.

vindictive warfare which finally ended in the defeat of the followers of Don Carlos.

During the past century, England and Spain have been clear of war, Spain having fallen to the position of a second or third-rate power, from the military, naval and imperial point of view. Indeed, the real rivalry for empire and sea-power between the two countries had ended long since, during Elizabeth's reign. The varied causes of Spain's retirement from the contest have been referred to elsewhere.¹ One of them was the war of eighty years which Spain waged against the Dutch in the vain hope of reducing that sturdy people to political and religious submission.

The Dutch became England's next rivals upon the sea. We have seen how by England's aid, Holland secured its independence from Spain. In the struggle, the Dutch seamen performed, perhaps, the major part. They had become hardy and skillful mariners in braving the stormy waters of the North Sea in their search for fish; and their fishing-boats they speedily developed into men-of-war and merchantmen. During the half-century after they had practically gained their independence, while England was absorbed in its Civil Wars, Dutch commerce, colonization and sea-power grew by leaps and bounds; and England gradually awakened to the fact that the place of her old rival and enemy, Spain, had been taken by the revolted Spanish colonies of Holland, whom England had helped to free.

As early as 1619, the English government made a treaty with the Dutch respecting their mutual trade and rivalry in the East Indies; but this peaceful attempt was nullified by a "massacre" of twelve out of eighteen English residents on the Dutch island of Amboyna (1623).

After Cromwell's triumph, the English parliament passed a navigation act which forbade the importation of goods into England except in English vessels or in vessels of the land in which the goods had been produced (1651). This

¹ See pages 92-3.

act was designed to strike at the Dutch carrying-trade and to favour England's. Together with other causes, it brought on the first of three wars (1652-4). The English and Dutch fleets, under the respective commands of Blake and Monk, Van Tromp and De Ruyter, fought battle after battle, first one and then the other gaining a famous, but not a decisive, victory.

When Cromwell decided to make war on Spain, a peace was made with Holland, which consented to pay damage for the massacre at Amboyna. But after Cromwell's death and the restoration of the Stuarts, the old rivalry broke into another war (1664-7). In this war, Dutch ships and East India Islands were captured; Dutch fleets were defeated at Lowestoft and at the mouth of the Thames; 160 merchant ships and a Dutch town were burned; two Dutch provinces were overrun by a warlike Bishop of Münster, hired by the English; and the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam (later called New York) was captured. On the other hand, the Dutch captured the English forts on the coast of Guinea, defeated an English fleet in a desperate four days' battle off the North Foreland, and sailed up the Thames, burned Sheerness and three men-of-war and captured a fourth. The Dutch secured the alliance of Louis XIV of France who gave but little aid, as he was soon to attempt the conquest of Holland itself and desired to see the English and Dutch fleets destroy one another. England suffered at the same time from another great visitation of "the plague" (1665), and from the Great Fire of London (1666). Pestilence, the expense and indecisiveness of the war, and the menace of France, which took Spain's place in the Spanish Netherlands as a neighbour to Holland and threatened the political and religious liberty of England, caused England and Holland again to make peace. This time, England was given New Netherland, which greatly strengthened its position in America, while Holland was left mistress of the spice islands in the East Indies (1667).

The aggressions of France caused a triple alliance speedily

to be formed between England, Holland and Sweden (1668). But King Charles II of England and Louis XIV of France were so intent on becoming autocratic in their respective lands, that Charles accepted large sums of money from Louis and agreed to send an English army of 6,000 men to fight with the French against Holland, while Louis was to send thirty French ships and 6,000 men to assist Charles, either against the Dutch, or, if necessary, against his own English subjects! At the end of the war, Charles was to receive three towns from Holland and various lands from Spain. When a favourable opportunity to attack the Dutch by surprise occurred (1672), the French army invaded Holland, and the English fleet attacked a rich Dutch merchant fleet in the Channel and captured two of its ships. To save their land, the Dutch cut their dykes and flooded it with water; while on the sea, they defeated English fleets at Southwold Bay and off the Texel. In this last battle, England's French allies stood idly by, hoping that the Dutch and English fleets would destroy each other (1673).

The folly of fighting each other to a finish, only to be gobbled up by the French, was at last hammered into the minds of the Dutch and the English, and they fought no more wars with each other, but became allies against their common French enemy in the terrible wars which followed (1689-1714).

In these wars, little Holland exhausted its resources in fighting its big French neighbour on the land, and it was never again able to be a rival of first-rate importance to England on the seas. During the American Revolution, it joined in the Armed Neutrality (1780) which attempted to resist England's domination of the seas.¹ And under the domination of the French (1795-1813), it was compelled to fight the English as best it could on land and sea. Under the French Directory, the Dutch fleet was to be employed in carrying an army of 14,000 men to attack the English

¹ See pages 263-4.

in Ireland; but it was defeated and destroyed by the English at the bloody Battle of Camperdown (1797). During Napoleon's control of Holland, its colony on the Cape of Good Hope was captured by England, and was ceded to the English at the Peace of Vienna in return for a payment of £2,000,000; and later in the Nineteenth Century, the British conquered and annexed the other Dutch settlements in South Africa.

When Belgium seceded from Holland (1830), England joined with France to compel Holland by a threat of war to recognize Belgium's independence. But since that time, the two countries have been at peace. Little Holland's big empire in the East Indies, and the fear of being conquered herself, caused her to maintain her neutrality during the wars between her big neighbours in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. She heartily welcomed the reduction and limitation of England's naval armaments, at the Washington Conference of 1921-22; but soon afterwards engaged in an effort to increase her own navy, because of the strengthening of England's naval base at Singapore, which menaces, the Dutch believe, their East Indian possessions. This is a terribly dangerous game for any power, especially a small one like Holland, to play at; and Holland will no doubt give her cordial adherence, for her own sake as well as her empire's, to the substitution of the peace-method for war and preparations for war.

Soon after Holland ceased to be England's rival and enemy on the sea, another maritime power arose in the North Sea and the Baltic to dispute England's ocean-sway. While the western powers were fighting one another during the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-14), Russia, Sweden and Denmark were engaged in the gigantic Northern War (1700-21).¹ Out of this war, Russia and Denmark emerged victorious, and were henceforth regarded as menaces to the western powers on land and sea. Their commerce grew in importance and they sought sea-power

¹ See page 65.

for its defence. In the American Revolution, to protect their merchant-ships against search and seizure by the English, Russia, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Prussia, Austria and Portugal joined in what they called the Armed Neutrality. England declared war upon Holland (1780); but the other powers remained neutral in name, although ready to attack England in case their ships were interfered with. The American Revolutionary War soon afterwards came to an end, and the Armed Neutrality dissolved for a time.

Twenty years later (1800), when England and France were fighting each other again in the Napoleonic Wars, the Armed Neutrality was revived, and England sent a fleet to break it up. This fleet attacked the Danish fleet and bombarded Copenhagen; Denmark was compelled to withdraw from the Confederacy (1801); and soon afterwards, the Czar of Russia was murdered, and his successor agreed to break up the Confederacy and to acknowledge England's right of searching neutral ships for goods owned by or consigned to Frenchmen.

The Danes continued to protest against England's high-handed domination of neutral trade upon the seas, and England feared that Napoleon would secure the Danish fleet and use it against them. Another British fleet and army were therefore sent to Copenhagen (1807); and when the Danes refused to surrender their fleet on the promise of receiving it back at the end of the war, Copenhagen was again bombarded, losing this time 2,300 of its houses and more than 2,000 of its citizens, and Denmark was obliged to hand over its fleet for use under the British flag.¹

This high-handed procedure led Denmark to make an alliance with France, and Russia too declared war upon England. But Napoleon's tyranny upon the land was more pressing than England's upon the sea; so that Europe presently united to accomplish Napoleon's downfall. Den-

¹ When the war ended, the British government declined to give back the ships on the plea that it had been necessary to use force to secure them!

mark made peace with England (1814), but lost Norway to Sweden as a penalty for having joined with Napoleon, and dropped into the rank of a third-rate power; while Russia pushed forward its imperial march across Asia, thus transferring its rivalry with England from the ocean to the vast continent of Asia.

But in the background, through all of England's rivalry and struggle with Spain, Holland and the Northern Confederacy, stood her ancient enemy, France. This enmity now, at the end of the Seventeenth Century, was deflected from its ancient channels of mutual conquest into new wars of imperial rivalry. The rivalry had begun in America as early as 1613-29, when an English expedition to capture Quebec was first repulsed and then succeeded. This conquest was soon restored to France (Peace of St. Germain, 1632), and the Civil Wars in England put an end for a time to aggressive warfare in the New World. But throughout the century, there were frequent raids of English and French, with their respective Indian allies, into each other's territory.

In the first of Louis XIV's wars of aggression (1666-8), England took but little part against France, being engaged at the time in war against Holland; but at the peace, England received some French West India islands, while France received Acadia, or Nova Scotia.

The third of Louis' wars (1689-97) was directed expressly against England, whose new king, William III, was also Holland's stadholder. This war was fought with the utmost determination in Scotland, Ireland, America, on the Atlantic and in Europe. A score of battles, massacres by the Indian allies of the French and English, the massacre of the Highlanders at Glencoe, the beginning of England's national debt: these were some of the aspects of a fierce war which ended, so far as England and France were concerned, by "the restoration of mutual conquests"!

Louis' fourth war was fought with the object of placing his grandson on the throne of Spain; but England would

not permit such an aggrandizement of her French foe and formed the Grand Alliance of England, Holland, Germany and Sweden against him. Under the leadership of the English Marlborough and the German Eugene, the French were defeated in a long series of battles in Italy, the Netherlands, Bavaria, Spain, and America. The Peace of Utrecht, which ended the war, gave to the Spanish people the French sovereign whom they desired and for whom they had fought; but on the other hand, Spain was obliged to cede Gibraltar to England, one of whose fleets had captured it during the war, and also to grant to England the *Asiento*, or exclusive right to supply Spanish America with African slaves; while France was obliged to cede to England her American possessions in Newfoundland, Hudson Bay Territory, and Nova Scotia (Acadia).

While France still retained large tracts of American land, England's hold on the New World was greatly strengthened, and the rivalry of the two countries for the monopoly of North America continued with redoubled vigour. They formed an alliance, indeed, to check the designs of Charles XII of Sweden, and to prevent the king of Spain from becoming king of France as well (1717). But in the wars of the Austrian Succession (1740-48) and the Seven Years' War (1756-63), England was again arrayed against France, although in the first of these England was allied with Austria against France and Prussia, while in the second England was allied with Prussia against France and Austria!

In the Austrian Succession War, the German king of England was chiefly concerned to defend his home-land of Hanover against the French; and he did so by an army of Hanoverians and Hessians. When English and Dutch troops attempted to defend the Netherlands against the French, they were defeated (at Fontenoy, 1745). On the other hand, the French attempt to restore the Stuarts to the English throne was a failure;¹ and the English captured the great French fortress of Louisburg in America.

¹ See page 239.

But when peace was made, there was again "the reciprocal restoration of all conquests."

The Seven Years' War (1756-63), or the French and Indian War as it was called in America (1754-63), was a disastrous one to French imperialist ambitions, and it gave a great stimulus to English imperialism. It was fought on the four continents of Europe, America, Asia and Africa, and on the oceans between. The French won "great victories" over the English on Braddock's Field in America, at Minorca, and in Hanover; but they divided their forces to fight both in Europe and on the oceans and beyond, and suffered a series of defeats on every theater of the war. Louisburg and Quebec in America; Rossbach in Germany; Lagos and Quiberon Bay, on the ocean; Plassey and Wandewash in India; such were the principal defeats which the French armies suffered, and which spelled a vast loss of life and property to both victors and defeated alike.

The result of the long struggle between England and France for empire beyond the seas (1613-1763), which came to a climax in this war, was to oust the French and establish the English in control of North America and India; while, at the same time, the gold and soldiers of England enabled Prussia to maintain its existence and start upon that career of military victories which were to lead eventually to the World War of 1914-18. In this, England and France were allied for mutual protection against the Prussian Frankenstein which their own militarism and imperialism had done so much to create.

Although France ceased for a time to be a formidable rival to England's empire, she did not finally relinquish the struggle. She seized upon the American Revolution as an opportunity for causing her rival to lose the American colonies, who rebelled against England immediately after their fear of France in Canada was removed. A stream of gold, an army of 10,000 men, and two fleets, crossed the Atlantic to render material aid to the Americans at York-

town (1781); but the French fleet was destroyed in the West Indies by an English one (1782), and a joint attack by the French and Spaniards upon Gibraltar was repulsed (1782).

France having been driven out of Canada was rejoiced to see within a score of years, this expulsion of England from the United States; but the task was still before her of restoring her own empire or of acquiring another one. During the American Revolution she had allied herself with the Mahratta Confederacy, in the vain hope of ousting the English from India; and during the French Revolution, she tried, but in vain, to oust the English from Ireland.¹ When Napoleon came to power, he first dreamed of establishing a French empire in Egypt and the Near East, and if successful in that, to replace the English in India. When his European conquests drew him off from this, Napoleon turned his attention to America, compelled Spain to cede back to France the Territory of Louisiana, and sent a fleet and army to conquer the Negro republic of Haiti as a base of operations for establishing a French empire in the Valley of the Mississippi. The Negroes of Haiti, however, under the leadership of Toussaint l'Ouverture, resisted fiercely this attack on their newly-won independence, and yellow fever destroyed the French invaders. Napoleon, therefore, gave up his design, sold Louisiana to the United States, and used the money for preparing a great expedition with which to invade England (1803).

Meanwhile, the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars were running their disastrous course in Europe. Although England had had its own revolution for the purpose of subordinating the power of its king to the power of its landed aristocracy (1688-89), it looked askance upon the French Revolution which planned to subordinate the power of both king and aristocrats to the power of the people. For a time (1789-93), the English government under William Pitt refused to yield to the violent denunciations of the

French by Edmund Burke and others, and maintained neutrality while the Germans were invading France. But when the French drove the Germans out and made an attack on the Netherlands, England entered the war on the side of the Germans (1793).

Austrian, Prussian and British armies at once invaded France, and their victories and menace to Paris caused the Reign of Terror and the universal uprising of the French people against the invaders and against the foes of the revolution in their own household. The English were driven from Dunkirk and Toulon, and the Germans were driven beyond the Rhine, while the French conquered the Netherlands and brought Holland under French control.

Though the Prussians and Spaniards made peace with France for a time (1795), the English and Austrians continued the war. England sent fruitless aid to the rebels in France, while France sent fruitless aid to the rebels in Ireland. An English fleet destroyed the allied French and Spanish fleets at Cape St. Vincent, but England's navy was immediately afterwards crippled by serious mutinies of the maltreated sailors. Napoleon overwhelmed the Austrians in Italy, and compelled them to make peace (1797); and then turned upon Egypt. He conquered Egypt on land; but his fleet was annihilated by the British under Nelson in the Battle of the Nile (1798), his expedition into Syria was checked by the British defense of Acre, and he was obliged to return to France (1799), leaving Egypt to be reconquered by the British and restored, nominally, to the Turks (1801).

Meanwhile, Russia had joined Austria and England against France, and the French armies had been defeated in Germany and driven across the Alps, where thousands upon thousands of men perished in battle and from exposure (1799). On Napoleon's return, the French again overwhelmed the Austrians in the bloody battles of Marengo and Hohenlinden (1800).

Austria and Great Britain then made peace with France,

in which Great Britain surrendered all its conquests, except Ceylon which it had taken from Holland, and Trinidad which it had taken from Spain, while France remained supreme on the continent (1801). The old "Holy Roman Empire" was practically destroyed; George III relinquished his predecessor's title of "King of France"; and Napoleon prepared to become "Emperor of the French."

This peace, which "every one was glad of, but no one was proud of," did not last long. There were various excuses made for breaking it; but the chief reason for renewing the war was the old imperialistic rivalry, England fearing that Napoleon would renew his attack on Egypt and therefore refusing to give up Malta, a key to the eastern Mediterranean, as it had promised to do. To these ambitions for empire in Europe and Africa, were added the lust for Louisiana or Canada in America and for India in Asia.

Napoleon's great preparations for the invasion of England came to nought, because of the impossibility of uniting the French and Spanish fleets for convoying the transports across the Channel. These fleets were defeated by the English under Nelson at Trafalgar (October 21, 1805); but Napoleon had already turned eastward against the Austrians and Russians, defeated and captured 40,000 Austrians at Ulm, the week before Trafalgar, and overwhelmed the Austrians and Russians at Austerlitz, six weeks afterwards (December 2, 1805).

Continuing his wars of aggression on the continent, Napoleon conquered Prussia the next year, defeated the Russians and divided up Europe with the Czar; while England maintained her mastery of the ocean by breaking up the Armed Neutrality of the North, and started the Peninsular War in Portugal and Spain which was to draw off Napoleon's forces in Central Europe and lead to his downfall. Austria armed once more against the French, but was again defeated at Wagram and conquered, this time, Napoleon thought, "for good" (1809). England sent gold

to Austria's aid, and also sent a fleet and army to the Netherlands (at Walcheren, 1809) to draw off Napoleon's forces from Austria, but lost thousands of men from fever without fighting a battle.

Napoleon's "Continental System" of blockade against British goods, which was designed to ruin British trade, caused prices to rise so high and such economic loss to afflict the continent of Europe, that at the very climax of his power his position was being undermined by popular discontent and he was tottering to his fall. His ill-fated Russian campaign (1812)¹ and the rise of the peoples in Germany and Spain swept him from his throne in Paris to a "throne" in Elba; whence he escaped for a "hundred days" of spasmodic effort and futile sacrifice of more victims to his insatiate ambition. England's army under Wellington and Prussia's army under Blücher put the finishing touch to his military ruin at Waterloo, and he dropped below the horizon of human anxiety in distant St. Helena.

For a generation after his fall, exhausted France strove to recuperate her stolen strength; but the blows which were struck, during that terrible quarter-century of warfare, at her human and economic resources have never ceased to retard her progress and undermine her welfare. England turned from foreign war to develop her industrial revolution and reform her political and industrial ills. She came out of the Napoleonic struggle with her empire increased by the Cape of Good Hope, and British Guiana (both taken from the Dutch), Malta and some islands in the West Indies. At the beginning of the French cyclone, England had sent her first colonists to Australia; and while the captains and the kings noisily filled the stage in Europe, the plowman and herdsman started the quiet building of an imperial domain in the great continent of Australia.

When France, in 1823, sent an army into Spain, England's foreign minister was determined that Spanish America

¹ See page 182.

should not also be dominated by France and the Holy Alliance; he accordingly endorsed the Monroe Doctrine, which barred the Americas as further fields of European colonization, and recognized the independence of the Spanish American republics.

A few years later, England and France joined with Russia to free Greece from Turkish rule, and their combined fleets sank or captured a Turkish fleet at Navarino (1827), thus compelling Greek independence. And a few years after this the English and French by a threat of war compelled Holland to recognize the independence of Belgium.

By this time, France had become a constitutional monarchy (1830) and the British parliament had been made more truly representative of the people (1832); so that there was good promise of permanent peace between them, especially since Russia, Austria and Prussia were still autocracies. But the poison of imperialism soon brought them to the verge of another war. England joined with Russia, Austria and Prussia in maintaining the Turkish power in Europe (1840), and the French, opposed at this time to supporting "the sick man of Europe," talked for a time of "revenging Waterloo" and reconquering Germany west of the Rhine. And yet within fourteen years, England and France were fighting the terrific Crimean War on the side of Turkey against Russia! ¹

The Emperor Napoleon III and Lord Palmerston had induced the French and British parliaments to join together to prosecute this war (1854-56); but when Palmerston tried to induce the British parliament to pass an act punishing the Frenchmen who formed plots in England to assassinate Napoleon, the parliament refused to do so, and Palmerston fell from office! The English came to believe, in fact, that Napoleon III, who defeated the Austrians in the bloody war of Italian independence and annexed Savoy and Nice (1859),² would next turn upon Prussia or England. They therefore looked with complacency upon

¹ See pages 185-6.

² See pages 109-10.

Prussia's defeat of Austria (1866) and Germany's defeat and overthrow of Napoleon (1870-1).

The downfall of Austria and France, and the rise of a new Germany and its future imperial and naval rivalry with Great Britain, were eclipsed for a time by another rival in the game of empire, namely, Russia. Russian colonization and conquest advanced step by step across northern Asia, during the Nineteenth Century, until the frontier of the Czar reached the Pacific. Here it came into conflict with the designs of Japan and Great Britain upon China, the "sick man of Asia." Japan and Great Britain, therefore, made an offensive and defensive alliance to check the further progress of the Russian "bear" (1902). It was under the shadow of this alliance that Japan fought with Russia the terrific war of 1905-6;¹ and after Russia's defeat abroad and revolutionary movement at home, this alliance was turned against Germany.

Meanwhile, Russia and England were watching each other's advance in Central Asia, and with each successive advance they were brought closer and closer to war with each other. While Russia was conquering Caucasia, Armenia, Bokhara, Khiva, Samarkand and Khokan, Great Britain was conquering the Punjab, Sindh, Sattara, Nagpoor, Burmah, Kashmir and Baluchistan. Across Afghanistan and Persia, the British and Russians eyed each other fiercely, and Constantinople, which controlled one route to India and to Russia, was a bone of contention. Repeated attempts, by war and by diplomacy, were made by each of the two imperial rivals to determine in its own favour the fate of Afghanistan, Persia and Turkey.

France, which became Russia's ally in the midst of this fierce rivalry, had also begun the acquisition of a new empire in northern Africa and southeastern Asia; and this was regarded as a menace to the British hold upon Egypt and India. The materials for a great war of empire, between Great Britain and Japan on one side and Russia and

¹ See pages 62-3.

France on the other, were thus piled up and ready for conflagration. When suddenly a new aspirant for empire, the modernized Germany, thrust forward as a rival to Great Britain, Russia and France alike. In common alarm, these three powers settled for a time their most imminent quarrels over Egypt and Persia, and Great Britain and France got together in the *Entente Cordiale* (1904), which was joined by the Dual Alliance of Russia and France to form the Triple Entente (1907).

Germany, the sixth rival of modern England in the game of empire, has had, in comparison with France, but little military contact with England. This is due in part to geographical separation, and in part to racial kinship. Germany was the fatherland of the Angles and Saxons, who formed the basic element in England's population in the days of its conquest, and Germans have continued to emigrate to Great Britain in considerable numbers during the following centuries. It was even the fashion for a score of years before the World War of 1914-18, while Germany, England and the United States were making their phenomenal advance in material progress, to speak of the "Anglo-Saxon supremacy," to which the world's culture was supposed to be destined.¹ But the bitterness of imperial rivalry and the hatred caused by war are thicker than blood; while difference in political ideals accentuates both.

Throughout the Middle Ages, England and Germany were both absorbed by their never-ending wars with France, and had but little dealings with each other except to seek and occasionally to form alliances against their common enemy.

At the close of the Middle Ages, England followed Germany's example in breaking with the papacy, and under the guidance of Thomas Cromwell tried to build up an Anglo-German, Protestant alliance against the Catholic powers of Austria, Spain and France. In the days of

¹ Cf., for example, the ideals of Cecil Rhodes and his Oxford Scholarships plan for realizing them.

Elizabeth and her Stuart successors, when the religious wars were being fought out on the continent, England extended aid (though not nearly so much as its people desired) to the north German and Dutch Protestant party.

While Germany was striving to recover from the terrible devastation of the Thirty Years' War, England was torn asunder by the Civil Wars and the Great Revolution. England's imperial rivalry with Spain, Holland and France, also engaged its attention and caused it to look with a favourable eye on the growing power of Prussia.

When the Prussian king Frederick II was beset on all sides by enemies, the English minister, Carteret, first tried to unite Prussia and Austria against the French, and when this failed England sent Frederick a continuous stream of gold pieces and drew off the resources of France by fighting the French on the ocean, in America and India, thus probably saving Prussia from conquest and subdivision. During the Napoleonic warfare, also, England, Austria and Prussia formed several coalitions and fought together for a quarter-century against the French, England claiming the chief credit for sea-power and Trafalgar, Prussia for land-power and the victories of Leipzig and Waterloo.

After Napoleon's downfall, England buckled down to the alleviation of political and industrial autocracy, while Prussia and Austria joined with Russia and at times with France to crush out all movements in favour of democratic reforms. When Prussia took up the task of unifying Germany, England looked on with complacency, even though Prussia resorted to military victory over Austria and France as a means of cementing the new German union by "blood and iron." In the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century, when the new Germany was developing its industrial and military power by leaps and bounds, England contented itself with clinching its now undisputed naval supremacy and extending and consolidating its vast empire, in rivalry with Russia and France.

Then, at the dawn of the Twentieth Century, Germany

suddenly forged to the front as a naval power of the first rank and demanded a share in the colonial and imperial power which was being struggled for by England, Russia and France. The Balkans, Turkey-in-Asia, Africa, the Far East, thereupon became the theaters of intense rivalry in exploitation and domination. Utterly regardless of the welfare of the "backward peoples" whose lands they were exploiting, and of the peace of the rest of the world, the imperial rivals eagerly pressed on their activities, and backed them up by enormous competition in the increase of armaments on land and sea. The Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente united these armaments in hostile hands and vigorously "rattled the sword in its scabbard" at every diplomatic crisis. Is it any wonder that under such circumstances the sword was finally drawn and used, or that the war thus fomented should have been such a fiendish one?

England's statesmen did what they could at the eleventh hour to prevent the resort to force in the last diplomatic crisis (1914), and feverishly urged the application of the peace-method of mediation and arbitration; but with such a welter of rival imperialism, armaments and alliances, in which they and the other statesmen were immersed, they were naturally doomed to failure.

The British Empire's part in the World War was a truly titanic one. On the oceans, in the air, in Africa, Asia and Europe, British men and money were lavishly expended. More than fifty billions of dollars (27½% of its entire national wealth) was the money-cost of the war to the British Empire; in young men: one million and a half killed or seriously wounded, another million and a half otherwise wounded or "missing"!

England, with such a tragic past of warfare to spur her on, has become a leader of those nations who are determined that "never again" shall the war-method be applied. Since the World War, she has given many splendid evidences of this leadership. She has resisted, ever since the armistice of 1918, the endeavours of the French to settle the German

Reparations problem by a resort to force in the Rhineland and the Ruhr. At the Washington Conference of 1921-22, she abrogated her offensive and defensive alliance with Japan, agreed to substitute for it the peace-method of conference, and accepted naval equality with the United States.

This last act, in view of the warlike history of the past and the dangerous possibilities of the future, is of the utmost significance and promise. No sooner had the World War come to an end than Englishmen and Americans were aware of a black cloud hanging over the Pacific and the Far East. They were aware, also, of an appalling increase in their respective armaments. Were the British and Japanese Empires to direct their dual alliance against the American Republic in an imperialistic rivalry for the exploitation of China? Was the United States to follow Spain, Holland, the Baltic Powers, France, Russia and Germany, in challenging the naval and imperial supremacy of Great Britain? These were the dire questions which pressed upon American and British hearts in those dark years of 1920-1921. Then came the Washington Conference, in which Britain co-operated loyally with America in striking a blow at competitive armaments and in dispelling the clouds of war forming over the Pacific and the Far East.

The British Commonwealth's acceptance of the Kellogg Pact, and Premier Macdonald's coöperation with President Hoover in applying it to the threatened war between Russia and China, and in striving for the disarmament of all the nations, are recent splendid illustrations of the British people's will to peace.

The United States

Although among the youngest of nations, the United States has become one of the largest and richest. Its size and wealth have been due largely to its comparative peace; and this has been due partly to its separation by two oceans from the nations of the Old World which have regarded the war-method as the normal one in settling their disputes,

and partly to its absorption in its own great task of subduing a vast continent to the uses of man. And yet it has not been wholly immune, by any means, from the war-curse common to all mankind.

In the three centuries of exploration and colonization, the American people shared in the Indian and foreign wars in which their respective mother-countries engaged. The colony which the French Huguenots founded in Florida was destroyed the next year by the Spanish, and three years afterwards its massacred colonists were avenged by a French Catholic who massacred the Spaniards (1565-8). Within six years after the first English colony was established in Virginia, its colonists attacked and destroyed the first French colonies at Port Royal in Nova Scotia and St. Savior off the coast of Maine (1613). Within twenty years after the Swedes established their first settlements on the Delaware, the Dutch of New Netherland conquered and annexed them (1655). Within ten years from this event, the English conquered New Netherland and New Sweden from the Dutch, and annexed them (1664); less than ten years later, the Dutch recaptured them, but surrendered them again to the English (1673-4). Two years after the English settled Charleston, South Carolina, the Spaniards attacked them, but were repulsed (1672); and thirty years after this, the Carolina settlers attacked the Spaniards at St. Augustine, Florida, but they too were repulsed, and went home to pay for the expedition by the issue of paper money (1702).

The rivalry for empire between England and France involved their colonists in mutual war for a century and a half. In James I's reign, occurred the attack on the French at Port Royal and St. Savior (1613). In Charles I's reign, one English attack on Quebec was repulsed, and another was successful, but New France was restored when peace was made (1628-32). In Charles II's reign, the English took Acadia (Nova Scotia) from the French, but restored it when peace was made, in return for some French Islands in the West Indies which were given to England (1667).

"King William's War" (1689-97), "Queen Anne's War" (1702-13), "King George's War" (1739-48), and "The French and Indian War" (1754-63), were American versions of wars fought in Europe between the motherlands, England and France.

In the first of these, Port Royal was captured and then given back. In the second, one expedition failed to capture Port Royal, another succeeded, and it together with all Acadia (Nova Scotia) was retained at the peace; meanwhile, an invasion of Carolina by a French and Spanish fleet was repulsed with great loss, and an English expedition of sixty-eight ships and 6,500 men against Canada met with similar failure. In the third war, an English attack upon the Spanish in Florida was repulsed, and a Spanish attack upon the English in Georgia was also a failure; while the strong French fortress of Louisburg was first besieged and captured and then returned to France!

In the last war of the series, Louisburg and a number of other forts were captured by the English; and, while the French inflicted a bloody defeat upon the English under General Braddock, the English under General Wolfe defeated them on the Plains of Abraham and captured Quebec.

The result of the long struggle for North America was the partial expulsion of the French and the temporary triumph of the English. This result was decided chiefly, not by the seven wars which were fought, but by the far more fundamental economic, political and racial factors which were characteristic of the two peoples. The wars were a cause of great loss of life and property to the colonists in the wild American lands, and were a great hindrance to their material, mental and moral progress. They were made darker and bloodier, too, because of the participation of the uncivilized Indians on both sides in the civilized white men's struggle.

The conflict between the white man and the Indians, on the soil of the United States, began only twenty years after Columbus' first voyage and continued until our own time.

In Porto Rico and Florida, in the Mississippi Valley and the great Southwest, the Spaniards had handled the Indians roughly and had lost and shed much human blood in their sanguinary conflicts.

The first English colony of 117 persons, planted on Roanoke Island, met with an unknown fate,—whether killed or absorbed by the neighbouring Indian tribes. The Virginians broke their early friendship with the Indians, who had saved their first colony from starvation, had exasperated them in various ways, and suffered a massacre of one-sixth of the colony (347), fifteen years after its foundation (1622); and twenty years later, three hundred more were massacred. Trouble began almost immediately in New England after the white men landed (1621), and culminated in the fierce Pequot War, in which the whites exterminated the Indians and their villages by fire and firearms (1637). In the Middle Colonies, also, whether under Swedish, Dutch or English settlers, there were repeated attacks and counter-attacks, and massacres of and by the Indian tribes.

At one time, the Indians united under their leader, "King Philip," to sweep the white men once for all out of their land and into the ocean whence they came. There ensued the horrible "King Philip's War" (1675-6), in which many of the white settlements were attacked and burned, and the New England Indians were exterminated or sold into slavery in the West Indies.

The French, from their first settlement at Quebec, had made friends with the Algonquin Indians, but had attacked and incensed the Algonquin's bitter enemies, the Iroquois (1609). The Iroquois had formed a confederacy in Central New York, and purchased firearms from the Dutch settlers. With this political and military strength, they became important allies of the English and fierce foes of the French; while the Algonquins sided chiefly with the French. Hence, the various wars between the English and French were made more horrible by the ferocities committed by their respective Indian allies.

Six times within thirty years, the French governors of Canada sent expeditions into New York, hoping to exterminate their Iroquois foe; but every attempt failed of its purpose, though accompanied by bloodshed and brutalities of every kind. The Iroquois retaliated by destroying the French settlements in Canada and massacring their Algonquin allies. When the French were conquered by the English (1763), the Algonquins under their chieftain, Pontiac, persuaded some of the Iroquois to join them against the victorious English, and for two years a desperate warfare raged all along the western and northern border. The Indians captured many of the border forts, but were at last subdued by muskets and smallpox, which was sent among them in infected blankets. Even the peaceable Indians, converted to Christianity, were murdered by the infuriated whites.

"Pontiac's Conspiracy," as this war was called, was the last attempt of the Indians to rid their land of the white men; and from this time they fought a constantly losing fight to retain enough land for their own subsistence. Even when the United States government took the place of the separate colonial and British governments, in dealing with the Indians, the story continues to be one of deceit, treachery, war and massacre. The hundred years that followed Pontiac's Conspiracy has been honestly called "a century of dishonour." Violated treaties, land-stealing, retaliation, war, inhuman deeds of violence: such is the shameful summary. A loss by the United States of a half billion dollars and tens of thousands of valuable lives; scarcely a hundred miles of territory between the Atlantic and Pacific which has not been the scene of an Indian massacre! Degradation, spoliation, pauperization, decimation by vice and disease: this was the treatment of the Indians in time of "peace."

Fortunately, the peace-method also was tried in the Colonial times, though all too feebly and it was utterly overshadowed by the war-method. In such colonies as Rhode Island, Georgia and Pennsylvania, and by the United

States in some parts of its domain, the Indians were well and wisely paid for the lands taken from them. In Pennsylvania, William Penn and the Quakers added genuine friendship and justice to their payments; some noble Christian missions (Catholic and Protestant) worked with success to civilize and uplift the Indians of the West. Predatory interests have constantly striven to defeat these peace-methods in the past; they must be met with eternal vigilance in the present and future, if the Indian is to be permitted to survive and flourish.

Besides their wars with the Indians, the French, Dutch and Spaniards, the American colonists had some tastes of civil war as well. A rebellion in Maryland (1645-6); a more serious one in Virginia (1676); a short war between Royalists and Puritans in Virginia and Maryland, as an outgrowth of the English Civil Wars; the overthrow of James II's governor, at the time of the Great Revolution in England (1689); a revolt in Boston against the impressment of sailors for English men-of-war (1747); the suppression of the Acadians in Nova Scotia, and the transportation of 7,000 of them to the southern colonies for refusing to take the oath of allegiance (1755); such were some of the preludes to the American Revolution.

This revolution was at the same time a civil war for political independence from Great Britain and a foreign war between the Americans, French, Spanish and Dutch, on one side, and the British on the other. The Americans and British fought each other on American soil, while the Europeans fought on the ocean, in the West Indies and in Spain.

In the opening battles at Concord and Bunker Hill, the Americans lost 600 men, and the British 1,300; but in the bloody battles which preceded and followed the British capture of New York and Philadelphia, the American loss was much more serious than the British. The fighting in the South was mutually destructive of many kindred lives, and was marked, as was that in the North, by guerilla warfare and Indian massacres. One British army of 6,000

surrendered at Saratoga (1777) to the Americans who, with the help of a French fleet and army, captured another British army of 7,000 at Yorktown (1781). This ended the war, as far as the Americans were concerned, though their European allies continued it for their own purposes for a year or two longer (1783).

After their independence was acknowledged, the thirteen independent States were called upon to decide the fateful question of whether they would remain politically united and maintain the peace with one another, or whether they would repeat on the soil of the New World the bloody history of the independent, separated, and warring states of Europe. A civil war in Massachusetts (1786-87), caused by the poverty and hardships of the war of the Revolution, and the imminence of war between Pennsylvania and Connecticut, and between New York and New Jersey, were stern warnings to the people and their leaders. They therefore made a desperate effort to overcome obstacles of many kinds, and succeeded in forming a Union and adopting a Constitution, under which they established a Supreme Court for the peaceful settlement of the disputes which would doubtless arise between the sovereign States.

It was only grinding necessity which overcame the reluctance of the people of the various States, and wrung from them their consent to form a political union. After four generations of beneficent success, this American experiment in political union and judicial settlement of disputes among sovereign States appears to be as natural and easy as the sunrise. But war-torn Europe, which so sorely needs a "United States of Europe," should take courage from America's success in overcoming what seemed to be insuperable obstacles to political union and judicial settlement, and do its utmost in this Twentieth Century to solve its own problem of peace and prosperity in a similar way.

The Supreme Court has been given an opportunity to settle by judicial process *eighty-seven* disputes between States of the Union, and every one of its decisions has been

accepted by the States and enforced solely by the power of public opinion. Thus the American Union is itself a most illustrious example of the substitution of the peace-method for that of war.

The treaty of peace between the United States and England, at the close of the Revolution (1783) left unsettled a number of disputed questions in regard to boundaries, occupied forts, debts and damages, etc. These were an increasing source of irritation between the two peoples; and their mutual hatred, engendered by the recent war, was still further embittered by the passions stirred up by the French Revolution (1789) and the war between France and England (1793). One large section of the American people was in full sympathy with the democratic ideals of the French Revolutionists, they were grateful to France for the aid rendered by her in their own war of independence, and they demanded that the Treaty of 1778 with France should be lived up to and war declared against England. Another large section of the people feared the excesses of the French Revolution, which they regarded as an attack upon the rights of property, rather than as a defence of the rights of man; and they believed that for their infant republic to plunge into the war against England would cause a civil war at home and result in the speedy collapse of the new-born Union.

President Washington and his advisers therefore decided that the public safety was the supreme law, and that the country should be kept neutral at all hazards. He decided, also, that the outstanding disputes with Great Britain must be settled by an application of the peace-method, or they would inevitably lead to the war which, without them, he found it so difficult to avoid. He accordingly sent the Chief Justice of the United States, John Jay, to England and induced the Senate to ratify the treaty which Jay negotiated (1794). This treaty began the history of modern international arbitration. It provided that the disputes over boundaries, British claims for debts and American claims

for damages, should all be arbitrated by international tribunals. These arbitrations were successfully concluded, the danger of war with England passed for the present, and the modern history of arbitration began.

The French were naturally exasperated that the United States should have refused to live up to its Treaty of 1778 and go to war with England, even though the preservation of national existence was the plea; and they made many attempts to force America into the war. A special embassy sent to settle disputes with the French Directory was insulted by the French foreign minister and a demand was made upon it for the payment of a bribe (1797). One of the envoys replied that America would appropriate "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute"; and President Adams proceeded to create an army and navy.

No battles were fought on the land in this war, as the French armies were engaged in desperate fighting at home and in Egypt, and could not attempt to invade America; but about 340 American merchant-ships were captured by French cruisers on the ocean, and several battles were fought between French and American war-ships. The pro-British and anti-French party in the United States was exceedingly anxious that the war should be pushed with vigour and that America should ally itself with Great Britain and the rest of Europe against the French revolutionists. But President Adams was determined to seize the first opportunity of making peace; and in opposition to his cabinet and political party he sent to France a special envoy, who succeeded in settling all disputes with Napoleon (1800). Although Adams had been one of the foremost leaders of the American Revolution, he declared that, regardless of all other acts in his public life, he would choose as the epitaph on his tombstone the words: "He made peace with France."

The Napoleonic Wars grew worse and worse in Europe and it was with the utmost difficulty that Adams' successors, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, were able to preserve

peace during the next twelve years with either France or England, both of whom in their eagerness to gain the victory over the other, committed many outrages upon the neutral rights of America. Finally, as the Baltic Powers formed an Armed Neutrality against the depredations of British ships on their commerce, so Madison finally led the United States into the War of 1812 against England.

This war was a series of battles on land, which did not succeed in the American conquest of Canada, or the British conquest of the United States. It included also a series of duels between ships on the sea which decided only that both American and British seamen were brave and skilful. The British burned the new public buildings in Washington, in revenge for the burning of a town in Canada, and blockaded all the American seaports with their fleet; while the Americans gained the only real battle in the war by the repulse of a British attack on New Orleans (1815), after peace had already been agreed upon!

It has been well said that the War of 1812 was the "most singular war in history." It was a matter of grave doubt whether the French or the British had done more damage to American rights, and hence whether the United States should fight England and thus help France, or fight France and thus help England. It was a war of a republic against a constitutional and parliamentary government which was engaged in what appeared to be a life-and-death struggle with Napoleon, a despot at home and the conqueror of Europe. Again, the British had withdrawn their obnoxious Orders in Council, the original cause of the war, only five days after the Americans had declared war, and weeks before either could hear of the other's action. Further, the only real battle in the war was fought two weeks after peace had been agreed upon. Seven hundred brave men killed, fourteen hundred wounded, in those twenty-five minutes of fighting, a fortnight after peace had been made. And finally, to cap the climax, the peace that was made did not settle any of the disputes which caused the war!

The war-method having failed to settle anything, the peace-treaty provided for another arbitration to settle the Canadian boundary dispute. And a few years later (1818), another and a most momentous application of the peace-method was made to prevent the fortification of the Canadian frontier. During the Revolutionary War the British had invaded the United States from Canada, and during the War of 1812 the Americans had made two invasions of Canada. After the latter war, both peoples began therefore to launch war-ships on the Great Lakes and to make other preparations for fortifying and "defending" the frontier. The statesmen of both countries realized that this would mean the creation in the New World of such a hostile frontier as that of the Rhine, and that its bristling guns and war-ships would constantly increase in expense and would constantly menace the peace between the United States and the British Empire.

They therefore met in conference and agreed that the war-ships already launched on the Great Lakes should be removed; that in future only small police-boats for the prevention of piracy and smuggling should be permitted on them; and that the land-frontier should be "protected" by neither fortress, garrison nor gun! The result has been that, although the United States had fought two wars with Great Britain in the first forty years of its existence, the peace has since been maintained, in spite of many disputes, between the two great and constantly growing peoples for more than a hundred years! Compare the peaceful history of this frontier of 5,000 miles with the bloody history of the Rhine, or the Austro-Italian Alps, or the Mazurian Lakes between Germany and Russia. In the latter cases, "impregnable fortresses" and "invincible armies" have been maintained solely, of course, for "defense"; and as a result, the never-ending fear and recurrence of terrible wars. In the former case, disarmament, a consequent opportunity for the use of the peace-method, and permanent peace!

Nor has the peace between Great Britain and the United

States been maintained because of the absence of disputes. There have been many disputes, some of them of very grave importance. But in the absence of armaments prepared to settle these disputes by the war-method, and in the presence of arbitration tribunals prepared to settle them by the peace-method, the peace-method has been tried again and again on many occasions, and it has met with unbroken success.

One of the gravest Anglo-American disputes settled by arbitration was that over the "Alabama Claims." When the North and the South were fighting each other over the questions of slavery and union, in the Civil War (1861-65), the aristocratic government of England sympathized with the South, and hoped that the American Union would be broken up. On several occasions, the North and Great Britain were perilously near an open break, which was prevented only by a strong democratic sympathy among the English people for the North. But a bitter feeling was engendered between the two peoples, and was greatly increased when the British government neglected to prevent the sailing from Liverpool of the cruisers *Alabama*, *Shenandoah*, and others sold to the South to prey on the North's merchant-ships. The merchant-marine and carrying-trade of the North were swept from the seas by these cruisers, and at the end of the war the American government demanded the payment of damages.

The British government declared that to pay the damages would be an acknowledgment of "dishonour" on its part and at first refused either to do so or to arbitrate the claims. Many prominent American officials also declared that they would not arbitrate "vital interests." The dispute dragged along for six or seven years, growing more and more bitter, until at last cool-headed British statesmen consented to arbitration, and cool-headed American statesmen withdrew the excessive claims for "indirect damages" which had been put forward. In 1873, an international tribunal of arbitration, sitting at Geneva, Switzerland, hav-

ing heard both sides in the dispute, handed down its decision, awarding the United States the sum of \$15,000,000, and thus settling by the peace-method a question which, if submitted to the war-method, would have cost several thousand times as much in money and many thousands of human lives.

On another notable occasion, the United States and Great Britain were on the verge of war, and were again saved from falling into the abyss by arbitration. In 1895, after many years of dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela over a boundary line in South America, President Cleveland threatened war against Great Britain unless it would consent to the arbitration of the dispute by the United States. The British government replied that the United States had no right to enforce arbitration or to act as arbitrator in such a dispute; and for a time war loomed up perilously near. But again the cooler heads on both sides demanded that the peace-method of arbitration should be tried. The British and Venezuelan governments agreed to arbitrate the dispute, and themselves selected as arbitrator a justice of the United States Supreme Court, who decided that most of the wild, unsettled land in dispute rightfully belonged to Great Britain.

Since that time, disputes and arbitrations have gone on as before, but never since has there been imminent danger of war between the United States and the British Empire. In many phases of world politics, the two countries have seen eye to eye; and it was probably due quite as much to American sympathy with England as with Belgium or France that led the American people to go into the World War on the side of the Allies. Billions of American money (which the British have already arranged to repay), American food, fuel, ammunition, ships and men were sent in enormous quantities to aid the British and her allies.

What then was the amazement of the two peoples, immediately after the close of the war, to find themselves engaged in feverish competition with each other in building up

gigantic naval armaments. In the Far East, too, the British still retained the defensive and offensive alliance with the Japanese which had been formed in 1902 against the Russians and renewed, after the Russian defeat in 1905-6, against the Germans. Now that the German fleet had come to so dramatic an end at Scapa Flow, Americans were naturally desirous of knowing against *whom* was the Anglo-Japanese alliance to be directed in the future. America's occupation of the Philippines, also, and her plans for great naval bases at Guam and Pearl Harbour, Hawaii, as well as Japan's inclination to resist America's policy of the "Open Door" in China and her assertion of "special interest,"—a kind of Japanese Monroe Doctrine,—in the Far East, all caused very serious tension between the three governments and afforded an eagerly used opportunity for the jingoes among the three peoples to stir up warlike spirit.

The statesmen of the three countries determined to do their utmost to dissipate the black clouds of war which had so suddenly concentrated over the Pacific. The Washington Conference of 1921-22 was accordingly summoned; and it resulted in the reduction and limitation of battle-ships, battle-cruisers and airplane-carriers; the acceptance of a 5: 5: 3 ratio for capital ships by Great Britain, the United States and Japan; the settlement of some of the pressing problems of the Pacific and the Far East; and the agreement that when other difficult problems in these regions arose they too should be settled by peaceful conference.

This successful application of the peace-method to the exceedingly difficult problems of naval armaments, the Pacific and the Far East, was the most brilliant achievement of President Harding's administration; and he spent the last weeks of his life in earnestly advocating the entrance of the United States into the International Court of Justice.¹

¹ As will be seen later (Page 298), Presidents Coolidge and Hoover have also developed and applied the peace-method in notable, perhaps in epoch-making, ways.

Besides the wars with France and England, the United States has engaged in four other foreign wars, namely, with the Barbary States, Mexico, Spain, and Germany and Austria; and it has had two experiences of civil war.

The Barbary States (Algiers, Tripoli and Tunis) were permitted and even encouraged by the European powers to prey upon the commerce of the infant American Republic, so that it should not become a rival to the commerce of Europe. The United States therefore, followed, at first, the old custom of paying an annual "exemption tax" for its merchant-ships entering the Mediterranean (1794-1801). When the great powers of Europe were engaged in the Napoleonic Wars, the United States decided to substitute some other arrangement for the payment of this tribute. War was accordingly resorted to (1801-5), Tripoli was bombarded and Derne was captured by American forces, and a treaty was made which placed the young republic on a basis of equality with the monarchies of Europe in dealing with the Barbary States. But no sooner were the Barbary Pirates gotten rid of, than the powers of Europe took over the domination and imperialistic exploitation of the western Mediterranean, its lands and peoples.

The war with Mexico (1846-8) was a sad blot on the history of the United States, and was honestly admitted to be so by such men as General Grant who participated in it. The Southern leaders who were in control of the government at the time were desirous of acquiring more territory for slavery, and more pro-slavery votes in the national congress. They accordingly annexed Texas (1845), which under its American settlers had seceded from Mexico and defended its independence in a short war against the Mexican troops (1836). Not content with this, they claimed as a part of Texas all the land reaching to the Rio Grande. Mexico denied this claim, on the basis of earlier Spanish and Mexican occupation, but two American armies were sent to enforce it.

These armies won about eight victories over the Mexican

troops, and American gunboats and troops put an end to Mexican rule in the Southwest and on the Pacific Coast. Mexico City was captured and the government was compelled to make peace (at Guadalupe Hidalgo, 1848). As a result of the "peace," Mexico gave up all claim to Texas and its land reaching to the Rio Grande, and ceded to the United States 40% of its own undisputed territory! In return for this imperial domain, Mexico was paid \$15,000,000.

The acquisition of all this new land made possible a great expansion of slavery and greatly accentuated the dispute over the slavery issue in the United States east of the Mississippi, thus becoming the immediate cause of the terrible Civil War in which the United States was plunged a dozen years later. The great Republic of the North has been heartily ashamed of this war with its little Sister of the South, and has refrained ever since from going to formal war with her again. But various exasperating incidents have occurred since, and an immense amount of patience has been demanded of both governments; and on two occasions, the United States has sent "punitive expeditions" into small portions of Mexico, once to coerce Huerta's government, another time to disperse Villa's robber-bands.

The peace-method has also been tried between the United States and Mexico on numerous occasions and on two of these in very interesting ways. During President Roosevelt's administration, a dispute of fifty years' standing was referred to the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague, and it was not only successfully settled, but it was the first case sent to that court since its establishment in 1899, and opened its doors to seventeen other disputes which have been settled by it since! In President Wilson's administration, a dispute with Mexico became so difficult of settlement that war was imminent for many months until at last President Wilson invited the aid of other American republics (Argentina, Brazil and Chile, Bolivia, Uruguay and Guatemala) to help settle it: thus setting a promising prec-

edent in Pan-American coöperation for the preservation of peace on the American continents. A persistent menace of war with Mexico over the land question, during the administration of President Coolidge was finally smoothed out by the conciliatory diplomacy of Ambassador Morrow and by the arbitration of mutual claims.

With Spain, the United States had two serious disputes in the early part of its history, which nearly led to war. Although Spain had been the ally of France and the United States in the Revolutionary War against England, it had been very much opposed to the new republic acquiring from England the lands between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi. The United States succeeded in acquiring these lands, but Spain held New Orleans and the lands along the lower Mississippi and refused to permit American commerce ingress or egress. The Western settlers, who could not then very easily carry their goods across the mountains to and from the Atlantic seaports, demanded that the United States should compel Spain to grant to them the right of navigating the Mississippi; and, failing this, they even advocated secession from the United States and union with Great Britain, who, they believed, would either force a way down the Mississippi or provide shipment for Western goods through the St. Lawrence.

President Washington, after he had achieved the Jay Treaty with England (1794), succeeded the next year in making a treaty with Spain,—at the height of the French Revolution's wars,—which settled the Mississippi problem on a peaceful basis. A score of years later, the United States was again in dispute with Spain, this time over the possession of East and West Florida and Texas. Again the war-spirit ran high; and it was greatly accentuated by the friendliness which the United States showed to the Spanish-American colonies then in revolt against their mother-country. But again the peace-method was tried with success. A treaty was made, under which Spain gave up its claim to West Florida and ceded East Florida, while

the United States gave up its claim to Texas and paid \$5,000,000 (1819).

The Spanish-American colonies, with the exception of Cuba and Porto Rico, succeeded in securing their independence, and were recognized by the United States. Spain was naturally desirous of subduing her colonists, and received a promise of aid from the Holy Alliance. This called forth from the United States the Monroe Doctrine and a statement from England that the British fleet could be counted on to protect Spanish-America from any such attempt on the part of the Holy Alliance. The Monroe Doctrine, however, shut out British coöperation with the United States in Latin America, as well as European interference there.

The American and British attitude and events in Europe prevented any serious attempt from being made by Spain or the Holy Alliance to subdue Spain's colonies, which made good their independence in Mexico, Central and South America, and in Haiti and San Domingo. But Cuba and Porto Rico were unsuccessful in securing their independence, and continued to suffer under Spanish misrule. Revolt after revolt occurred and was suppressed, with cruelty and atrocities committed on both sides. As an important source of sugar, and a naval base of strategic importance in the Caribbean, Cuba had a special interest for the United States. Finally, during the desperate attempt of the Spaniards to suppress a Cuban revolt of long standing, an American war-ship, the *Maine*, was sent to Havana harbour. Here, it was blown up and American marines were killed or drowned. The Spanish government was accused of being implicated in the explosion and war ensued (1898).

The Spanish fleets were quickly annihilated by the Americans, in Manila Bay and off Santiago, and their army in Cuba was compelled to surrender after a few small battles. Spain thereupon surrendered Cuba, Porto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines to the United States, and received in return \$20,000,000.

This war, which was caused by the mixed motives of

humanity, economic and strategic interest, and vengeance for the loss of the *Maine*, could have been prevented, the American minister to Spain declared, if he had been given only forty-eight hours longer in which to negotiate with the Spanish government. His negotiations would probably have resulted in Spain's withdrawal from Cuba and Porto Rico, but not in its withdrawal from the Philippines. As for the *Maine*, an American commission reported that its explosion was due to an external cause, while a Spanish commission reported that it was due to an internal cause; an impartial, international commission should have been appointed to ascertain the real truth and submit it to the public opinion of the two countries directly interested and of the world.

If the peace-method of further negotiation and an international commission of inquiry had been adopted, the war might have been prevented and the same or better results achieved. Hundreds of lives were lost in the war, the Americans dying chiefly from fever and the "embalmed beef" which American profiteers sold their government for its soldiers to eat. Porto Rico was retained by the United States, but Cuba was handed over nominally to its own people; while the Philippines cost the United States another war, and have been promised eventual independence by both American political parties.

The war against the Filipinos began almost immediately after they and the Americans together had expelled the Spaniards. They insisted that their old rulers, the Spaniards, having been gotten rid of, they should be allowed to rule themselves. The American reply was that they were not yet ready to rule themselves, and that if given independence they would fall a prey to some other great power, Germany, Great Britain or Japan. Their answer to this was that they preferred to take the risk of remote danger and meanwhile were determined not to submit to becoming the prey of the United States and its sugar and tobacco monopolists.

The war, of course, had only one conclusion, in view of

the superior resources and skill of the Americans; it dragged along, however, for eighteen months, being almost solely of a guerilla nature, and was ended finally by the surrender of Aguinaldo, the Filipino leader, to the adroitness and deceit of General Funston. An unknown number of Filipinos, and a comparatively few Americans, lost their lives in this discreditable war. One of its discreditable features was the fact that the Americans did not abstain from the use of some of the cruel methods of their barbarous foes,—such as the abominable “water-treatment.”

The relations between the United States and Germany were of a predominantly friendly character from the time that Frederick II of Prussia extended the hand of friendship to the infant American republic in the days of the Revolution, down to the beginning of the Twentieth Century when the new Germany began to pursue its naval and imperial ambitions. The American people came to believe that, in its determination to found a colonial empire *somewhere* on the face of the earth, Germany was cherishing designs upon South America. The peace-method was tried at first. One dangerous dispute over the Samoan Islands, in 1889, was settled by conference; and another even more dangerous one over Venezuela was settled, in 1903, by the Hague Court of Arbitration.

But when the World War came, American sympathy was with Belgium, England and France; America's indignation was aroused against German atrocities; its ignorance of the atrocities committed by the Allies was as great as its ignorance of the game of empire which the European countries had so long been engaged in; its anger at English disregard of the rights of American neutral trade was swallowed up in its anger at German disregard of the rights of American neutral lives; and its inborn hostility to Germany's military autocracy outweighed its dislike of Russia's military autocracy, the French republic's militarism, and England's navalism. Hence it went into the war against Germany and Austria with the utmost vigour of which it

was capable under the difficulties of a trans-Atlantic war on an enormous scale.

America's part in the war, aside from the billions of money and mountains of ammunition and supplies which it shipped to the Allies, was limited chiefly to about a year's fighting in the trench-warfare in France and the pursuit of the Germans to the Rhine. Its losses in human life were naturally far less than those of the Europeans, and more than half of its deaths were due to disease abroad or at home,—especially to the Influenza, one of the fatal war-born diseases, which swept the camps of young men in training for the war on American soil.

About 50,000 Americans were killed in the war; about 57,000 died of disease; 40,000 more were seriously wounded; and 150,000 otherwise wounded or "missing." The money-cost was about thirty billion dollars. Thus, in that single year of war, the United States lost more men and money than in all its other foreign wars combined.

The Civil War (1861-65) cost the United States more men, though less wealth, than did the World War. It had been preceded by one ominous revolt, fought on a very small scale, and a few years after the founding of the Union. This was in 1794, when the whiskey-distillers of Western Pennsylvania refused to pay a federal tax on whiskey and summoned the people of the State to defend them by armed force. President Washington thereupon sent the militia of Pennsylvania and several neighbouring States to the scene of the rebellion, which speedily collapsed, without a battle and with very little bloodshed.

On several subsequent occasions, there were threats of nullification, secession and armed resistance, on the part both of Northern and Southern States; but these crises were all peaceably passed until the great Civil War of 1861-65. Directly caused by the dispute over the extension of slavery to the lands acquired from Mexico, indirectly by the existence of slavery as such, and fundamentally by the question of the powers and inviolability of the Union, this war was

fought with the utmost tenacity by the South and with grim determination on the part of the North.

One-third of the thirty-three States (all of them in the Southern, slave section) seceded, and the war was confined almost entirely to that section. The Union armies under General Grant fought a series of battles in an eighteen months' campaign ending with the capture of Vicksburg, Mississippi, which gave the North the control of the Mississippi River and cut off the South from an important source of its supplies in Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas. The Northern armies under General McClellan had been striving meanwhile to capture Richmond, Virginia, the Southern capital, which was defended by the chief forces of the South under General Lee. Ten or a dozen bloody battles were fought in the attempt to reach Richmond, in 1861-63, but in vain. General Lee also failed in his two attempts to invade the North, being defeated at Antietam and driven from Maryland (1862), and at Gettysburg and driven from Pennsylvania (1863).

On the day after the Gettysburg battle, Vicksburg was surrendered to General Grant, who was then brought to Virginia to attempt the capture of Richmond. By the expenditure of many thousands of lives, in another series of ten or a dozen battles, Richmond was finally captured (1865), and the war came to an end.

In the course of the war, slavery was abolished, as a war measure to recruit the slaves against their Southern owners, and without compensation; but this sudden abolition, accompanied by the conferring of the suffrage upon the freedmen, without adequate facilities for the education of the Negroes, resulted in their exclusion from the political rights of citizens and in a drive against their civil and social rights which has developed a serious Negro Problem. The Union of the States was preserved by the military method; but if the slavery problem had been settled by the peace-method which the English had used in freeing their slaves in the West Indies, namely, by gradual eman-

cipation and compensation to the owners, the question of secession from the Union would not have been raised, or would have failed as it had failed several times before.

The direct cost of the war to the North was five billions of dollars and 600,000 lives; and to the South, it was four billions of dollars and 300,000 lives.

From the above outline it is seen that, with the exception of the Civil War and wars with the Indians, the military history of the United States has been small in scope and volume; while its applications of the peace-method have been numerous and full of significance both for itself and for the future welfare of the world. With its participation more and more in world affairs, it is of vital import that it should adhere tenaciously to the peace-method, which is at the very root of its history and is illustrated by many notable incidents in its career. The words of President Harding in opening the Washington Conference of 1921, that "America wants less of armament and none of war," and Secretary Hughes's great initiative at that conference must be validated by the American people if they desire to remain true to their best ideals and to promote the best welfare of humanity.

A most notable, perhaps epochal, development of the peace-method was made in President Coolidge's administration by the negotiation of the Kellogg Pact. In response to an invitation from the French foreign minister, Aristide Briand, to make a treaty outlawing war between the United States and France, the American secretary of state, Frank Kellogg, proposed to all the nations the adoption of a treaty solemnly renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, and mutually pledging one another to the settlement of *all* disputes of whatever nature or origin which may arise between them by *peaceful* means *alone*. This treaty was signed and ratified by forty-six nations before July 24, 1929, on which date President Hoover declared its going into force; and almost immediately thereafter it was utilized to prevent a threatened war between China and Russia, both

of which countries had become parties to it. Because of it, also, President Hoover declared that the world's armaments should be drastically reduced; and he and Prime Minister MacDonald of Great Britain, announced the suspension of a proposed increase in American and British naval armaments. They have agreed, also, to hold in January, 1930, another conference of the naval powers for continuing the work of the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921-22 and the further reduction of naval armaments as a basis for the reduction of armaments of all kinds by all the nations of the world.

Latin America

The twenty other republics, besides the United States, in the North and South American continents, have had their full share of the world's military history. One can only guess at the thousands of years of prehistoric struggle among the peoples of the New World, which was perhaps first accentuated and then mitigated by the immigration of people across the Pacific from Asia who possessed a superior culture (the "Heliocentric").

Just before the coming of the white men and the beginning of America's real history, there were three outstanding peoples who dominated the others, namely, the Incas, the Mayas and the Aztecs.

From the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries, the Incas exercised wide power over their neighbours in a large part of western South America. This power was of chiefly military origin, and based on war, armies, forts, military colonies, recruits and tribute. Their militarism has caused them to be called "the Romans of the New World," and the barbarism of their warfare was probably not excelled until Pizarro and the Spaniards taught them the refinement of cruelty.

The Mayas of Central America appear to have flourished chiefly from the fifth to the seventh centuries; but they have left little record of their activities except the impressive

ruins of some large towns. Their military (and perhaps political) domination of Central America was ended by their own decay, which seems to have been due to a rise in temperature and the growth of the jungle into the equatorial rain-forest. Then, the struggle with nature in one of her most gigantic forms, became more fatal to men than their wars with one another; while the latter decreased their powers of resistance to tropical nature's assaults.

The Aztecs formed a confederation of tribes which held sway over a part of Mexico and Central America for about two centuries before the coming of the Spaniards. The terror which their wars of conquest and military rule produced was heightened by their sanguinary religious rites of human sacrifice and cannibalism, these, too, being based on militarism.

The Spaniards, too, appear upon the threshold of American history as "conquerors." Under Cortez in Mexico, Pizarro in Peru, and many a lesser leader, they overthrew the Aztec and Inca military supremacy and substituted their own. Their conquistadores, captains-general, adelantados, viceroys and intendants exercised supreme political power, based upon military force. Their quest for gold was followed by the establishment of colonies rooted in conquest, and greed plus violence made a vicious combination.

In many places, as at Santiago in Chile, and on the Rio de la Plata, an Indian massacre preceded the founding of the colony, and renewed attacks, destruction, rebuilding and mutual slaughter followed in logical succession. Steel-clad knights and sandaled monks, corsairs and buccaneers, "converted" Indians, Negroes,—a motley crew fought their way inland into the vast continent or along its coasts.

No sooner were the colonies settled under these auspices than revolts against the Spanish rule began. Accompanied usually by Indian wars of vengeance, their suppression was a bloody and cruel affair. The French, Germans, English and Dutch, also, carried their wars in Europe over into

Spanish America, and Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Venezuela and Argentina became the theaters of this warfare. England conquered the La Plata region in 1806, and held it for a few years. The Dutch "beggars of the sea" harried the coasts of Brazil, held the colony for forty years (1624-61), and permanently retained Dutch Guiana.

The Spaniards succeeded in transplanting to the Indian world which they conquered the rudiments of civilization; and it is to their lasting credit that they listened to the urgent pleas of the Jesuits and forbade the enslavement of the Indians. The slave-hunters and the planters were determined, of course, that the iniquitous system should include both Indian and Negro slaves; but the government firmly withstood them, as far as the Indians were concerned, though it accepted Negro slavery as the lesser evil and a supposed economic necessity.

Although the Spaniards were wedded to paternalism and wholly neglected the training of the people in self-government, they did much for their education in other ways, even establishing universities in Mexico City (as early as 1561), in Lima and elsewhere. But their work for education was largely nullified by the establishment of the Inquisition in Mexico and Peru (as early as 1570) and in other places. This iniquitous tribunal was established for the suppression of certain evils, such as bigamy and "witchcraft"; but its chief fury was directed against "heresy," and in trying to stamp it out, gross cruelty and deceit were accompanied by a censorship of the press which crippled intellectual progress.

Against the selfish policies of Spain and Portugal, a revolt occurred in Brazil, with the beginning of the French Revolution (1789); but it was not until Napoleon occupied Spain and Portugal, in 1808, that the revolutions in Latin America became serious. Under the leadership of Hidalgo, Bolivar, San Martin and others, the people rose against their rulers, and continued the war for a half-dozen years after the Napoleonic wars in Europe had ended. Many minor battles were fought in this War of the Revolution, in various locali-

ties; but the colonists united their forces finally and won the bloody victories of Boyaca (1819) and Carabobo (1821).

The Spanish and Portuguese governments being evidently unable to put an end to the revolution, the United States and England recognized the independence of the new republics, and Spain reluctantly did so within the next half-century.

The struggle had been a protracted and sanguinary one, marked not only by expeditions from beyond the sea, but also by a fierce and vindictive civil war. Uncounted thousands of lives were sacrificed, large areas were devastated, and many small settlements were wiped out, in the gigantic continents which had demanded so much of human toil even in the first steps of their subjection to the uses of civilized man. How foolish, as well as wicked, in the face of such a task, to waste precious human lives and capital in mutual warfare and slaughter!

The Revolution left its lasting impress for the worse upon the future of the Latin Americans. Aside from the loss in human labour and capital which they had suffered, they had acquired revolutionary habits, military officers continued to dominate their governments, and for many years these were not genuine republics, but military despotisms, tempered by frequent revolts and revolutions. Every one of the twenty Latin American Republics has had a share in this bloody history of revolt and revolution.

Brazil separated from Portugal and established an independent empire of its own (1824-89). A war with Argentina led to the secession of the Brazilian province of Uruguay (1827). A revolt caused the abdication of Pedro I (1831). The empire was overthrown in the Revolution of 1889, and the new republic was at once engaged in suppressing local revolts against it. Military and naval chieftains revolted against the early presidents, succeeded them in the presidential chair, and were themselves ousted by new revolts.

Argentina, adopting a constitution in 1827, had to sup-

press revolts against it; and when the soldiers returned home from the war with Brazil, they took a hand in the revolts, set up their leaders as presidents and established military dictatorships. In the course of this reign of terror, more than 20,000 persons were shot, beheaded, poisoned, or otherwise done to death. The military despot who came out on top in the struggle (Rosas) ruled with an "iron hand" for thirty years, engaged in several foreign wars, as well as civil, and was finally overthrown by another military revolution (1852). A civil war against the Union (1854-62) was led by Buenos Aires, but when the armies of the latter gained the victory over those of the Union, Buenos Aires itself became the capital of the Union and its successful military leader became its president!

Uruguay owed its independent origin to a successful revolt against Brazil, and promptly became for a score of years (1830-51) a battle-ground for rival parties, the Colorados and the Blancos, and the prey of rival generals. The civil wars culminated in "the great civil war" (1843-51), in which the French, Argentineans and Brazilians intervened. A few years later, Brazil was again invited to intervene for the suppression of renewed revolts (1854), and for three years the country was occupied by Brazilian soldiers. Argentine troops then invaded Uruguay and tried to unite it with Argentina, but the invaders were defeated, captured and ruthlessly shot down after surrender (1857). Three years later, another revolt was followed by another intervention of Brazilian soldiers and ships and a civil war, with more bloody battles and sieges, lasted for five years (1860-5). Another civil war (1870) avoided foreign intervention, and was ended by a compromise over the division of offices! More revolts dotted the next three decades, the first president to fill out his term in peace dating from 1890-94! Ten years later, after two more revolts, Uruguay ended its sanguinary history of seventy-five years and settled down at last to the peace-work of political reform and social welfare.

Paraguay started its independent history with a military dictator, Francia "El Supremo," who ruled for a quarter-century, (1816-40) by means of espionage, torture, manacles, exile and executions. Another dictator, Lopez, carried on a ten years' war against Brazil and Argentina, hoping to conquer his big neighbours and become the "Napoleon of South America" (1860-70). This was a war of gunboats and land battles, in which a large percentage of Paraguay's men and youths were killed, and in one of which Lopez was himself finally defeated and slain. Argentina and Brazil had also lost many men, and they maintained troops in Paraguay for another half-dozen years to prevent another outbreak. For forty years after this war Paraguay continued to enjoy revolts and revolutions, both bloody and bloodless, military leaders following each other as president in rapid succession; and even now it is having extreme difficulty in discarding militarism and settling boundary disputes.

Chile, too, started with a dictator, O'Higgins, but his was a comparatively peaceful rule (1818-22). The Spanish royalists caused several revolts in the republic's early years; but the most serious revolt did not come until 1891, when the civil war nearly caused war with the United States. Meanwhile, Chile had fought a war with Spain (1861-66), and one with Peru and Bolivia (1879-84).

Bolivia's successive presidents were deposed by revolutionists or by outside invaders coming especially from Peru, with which it has had a boundary dispute lasting to the present day. The revolutions of 1848, 1857, 1864, 1870, 1876 and 1899 were marked by the usual battles and occasionally by the massacre of state prisoners or prisoners of war.

Peru had its civil wars and dictators, wars with its neighbours and with Spain, but it managed to repel intervention by invaders who made civil war in Bolivia and elsewhere so cruel and vindictive.

Colombia, soon after its foundation by the dictator,

Bolívar, faced civil wars in which Venezuela and Ecuador seceded (1830). These were followed by other fierce revolts and civil wars between the Liberals and Clericals.

Ecuador, after its secession from Colombia, experienced a long period of tumult, revolt, civil war and revolution, in which ten or a dozen governments were overthrown by military violence and atrocities of various kinds.

Venezuela, after its secession from Colombia, experienced as many as *fifty* revolts or revolutions within a period of seventy-five years!

The republics of the West Indies and Central America shared with their South American sisters the bloody history of civil war.

Cuba, from 1823 to 1898, had a succession of revolts against the Spanish government which still clung to it long after its sister republics had secured their independence. Guerilla war, with its usual horrors, accompanied these revolts; the last of them was marred by "concentration" of the people of entire districts within camps, guarded by soldiers and barbed wire, so that they could not raise food-products with which to supply the rebels. This barbarity finally led to the intervention of the United States, and a war in which Spain relinquished sovereignty over Cuba (1898).¹

The Dominican Republic was handed over by Spain to France (1795); revolted against France (1808); was given back to Spain (1814); secured its independence (1821); was immediately conquered by Haiti and ruled by this neighbouring republic for twenty years (1822-44); secured its independence again (1844); plunged into a series of revolts and wars with Haiti, which ended in a voluntary return to Spain (1861); engaged in an especially bloody "War of the Restoration," in which Spain was defeated and again relinquished its sovereignty (1863-5); and then enjoyed another period of extreme turbulence, caused by the revolt of generals, their struggles for supreme power, and

¹ See pages 294-5.

their exercise of a cruel and relentless dictatorship (1865-1900).

Haiti secured its independence of both Spain and France in a series of battles and massacres, and was aided greatly by the ravages of the yellow fever, which the white man found it difficult to withstand. Its determination to unite the whole island in a single republic led to long warfare with the Dominican Republic; and its own civil wars and revolutions were not only continuous, but were characterized by fantastic, ridiculous and atrocious excesses committed by its various military despots.

Among the Central American states, Costa Rica is honourably distinguished by a paucity both of revolutions and of quarrels with its neighbours. Salvador, on the other hand, has had many disputes with its neighbours, and has experienced intervention and invasion by them in its own numerous civil wars. Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua repeat also the weary history of revolt and civil war, checkered by intervention and invasion by and against their neighbours.

Panama owes its independence to a revolt from Colombia, which was made successful by the United States (1903); and throughout its brief existence it has been a protégée and protectorate of the United States.

Mexico started its independent career as an "empire" (1821-23); this was followed by a "republic," which experienced a succession of revolutions, and a succession of dictators (Santa Anna, Juarez and Diaz). Its great province of Texas was settled by American pro-slavery planters, who were determined to maintain slavery in defiance of the Mexican law against it, and who declared the independence of Texas and defeated in several battles the Mexican forces sent against them (1836). This led to a war with the United States (1846-48); then came more revolts (1848-61), the intervention of France, and the establishment of a second "empire" (1861-67). The military dictatorship of Diaz covered nearly forty subsequent years

(1871-1911), and then five more civil wars or revolutions, complicated by disputes with the United States. In one of these revolutions, Mexico City itself was bombarded for ten days by the rebels (1912), and thousands of citizens were slain in the streets.

As to foreign wars: England has been involved with Argentine, Venezuela and Nicaragua. Argentine settled a small colony on the Falkland Islands, which the English claimed as their own; whereupon an English cruiser hauled down the Argentine flag and the English sovereignty was declared and acknowledged (1833). England's quarrels with Venezuela over a boundary (1895) and over claims for damages (1902), and its long-standing dispute with Nicaragua over the Mosquito Indians' land and sovereignty, led to the threat and show of force by the United States and almost involved it and England in war on at least two occasions; but all three of the disputes were finally settled by treaty or arbitration.

France intervened in a civil war in Uruguay (1843-51) and came into conflict not only with one section of the Uruguayan people, but also with the Argentinean army which had intervened in behalf of that section. French and English ships thereupon blockaded the Rio de la Plata, while French ships blockaded the entire coast of Argentina and seized an Argentine island (1845); the European allies also landed troops in Uruguay and tried to open the Parana River. All this fighting meant the loss of many lives, and at the end of it, both the Argentines and the Europeans withdrew from Uruguay and made a peace, Article V of which declared that there were "neither victors nor vanquished"!

The most formidable attack made by France upon Latin America was its attempt to establish a French empire in Mexico (1861-67). The story of this attempt has been told elsewhere.¹ It was resisted with the utmost vigour and with a great loss of life and property by the Mexicans, but

¹ See pages 187-8.

would probably have been temporarily successful, had it not been for the difficulties in which Napoleon III and the French became involved with the United States, Austria, Italy and Prussia.

Spain, having lost its American colonies and reluctantly and very tardily recognized their independence, became involved in several wars with Chile, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, Ecuador and Cuba. When the French were making war upon Mexico, and while the United States was involved in its own terrible Civil War, Spain attacked Peru (1861-66). Spain had not yet recognized Peru's independence, and its ships seized some of the valuable Peruvian guano islands. Chile thereupon came to the aid of Peru, and Bolivia and Ecuador also entered into the alliance. The war included the familiar coast-blockades, naval battles, bombardment of seaports, and some skirmishes on the land. After it had dragged along for a decade, the United States offered its mediation and peace was made. The war was only a loss to Spain, while it made the Latin American states, especially Chile, determined to enter into the race for naval armaments and forts.

After the Dominican Republic had secured its independence of Spain (1821), it was conquered and ruled for a score of years by Haiti; and even when it broke loose from Haiti (1844), it was still invaded from time to time by that neighbouring republic. One Dominican faction therefore decided,—while France was fighting the Mexicans, and the United States was busy with its Civil War,—to regain Spanish sovereignty. A treaty was made to that effect (1861), and for two years the Spanish flag waved again over San Domingo. Then came the inevitable war (1863-65), in the course of which another faction offered annexation to the United States. The Spanish troops, however, were defeated by the Dominicans in several very bloody and barbarous battles and the Spanish government again withdrew.

The United States has been at war with no South Amer-

ican state; but it has used the threat and show of force against Paraguay, Chile and Colombia. The nearer Central American states and Mexico have felt the tramp of American soldiers, and have lost many men in conflicts with their big neighbour.

The war of 1846-48 with Mexico has been described elsewhere.¹ Many difficulties continued to arise between the two neighbours during the next two generations; but it was not until the recent revolutionary years since 1911 that the United States again used armed force. On three occasions (in 1914 and 1916), American marines or American troops occupied Vera Cruz and pursued Mexican rebel-bandits through northern Mexico. These last conflicts, fortunately, caused but little loss of life and property and were settled without the annexation of more Mexican land to the United States.

The financial weakness of Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, and the consequent civil wars and danger of intervention by European creditor-nations, have led the United States to make virtual protectorates of these small republics. The protection of their customs-houses against rebel raiders and the prevention of attacks on the property of American investors have been carried out by the landing of American marines on their soil, and at times the occupation of their towns and participation in their battles.

Cuba and Panama, also, which owed their independence from Spain and Colombia to the United States, have been kept under American tutelage and have several times experienced intervention on the part of the United States and the presence (not active, but threatening) of its armed forces.

The wars among the Latin American states themselves have not been so numerous as the civil wars that have been waged almost continually within them, but there have been far too many of them.

Brazil has been engaged in war with Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Peru and Bolivia; *Argentina* with Brazil, Uru-

¹ See pages 291-2.

guay, Paraguay, Peru and Bolivia; *Uruguay* with Brazil and Argentina; *Peru* with Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Colombia and Ecuador; *Paraguay* with Brazil and Argentina; *Chile* with Bolivia and Peru; *Bolivia* with Chile, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Ecuador; *Colombia* with Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru and Panama; *Venezuela*, with Colombia; *Ecuador* with Colombia and Peru; *Pamana* with Colombia and Costa Rica; *Salvador* with Guatemala and Nicaragua; *Nicaragua* with Salvador and Honduras; *Guatemala* with Salvador; *Costa Rica* with Panama; and *Haiti* with the *Dominican Republic*; and *Honduras*, with Nicaragua.

Thus it is seen that, of the twenty Latin American republics, all but Mexico and Cuba have been at war with one or more of their neighbours. The fact that these wars have been between neighbours is evidence that they have been caused chiefly by disputes over boundaries. A few have been wars of intervention or secession.

The valley of the Rio de la Plata and Parana lying between the large states of Uruguay and Paraguay, has been "the dark and bloody ground" of South America. Here the Portuguese fought the Spaniards, in the days of exploration and colonization; here "the Great War" of 1843-51 was fought, and the subsequent struggles (1854-57) between Argentina and Brazil occurred. Like the "Middle Kingdom" between France and Germany, so Uruguay and Paraguay and the rest of the great river-valley became a cause of bitter struggle between South America's two large states of Brazil and Argentina.

Another "South American Alsace-Lorraine" lies on the Pacific coast in the province of Tarapaca and the districts of Tacna and Arica. This is a land of harbours and sea-ports and is especially rich in nitrates; hence it has been the cause of a three-cornered struggle among its neighbours, Chile, Peru and Bolivia. In the course of this long struggle, one serious war,—the "War of the Pacific" (1879-84),—has been fought between Chile on one side against Peru

and Bolivia on the other. The Chileans destroyed Peru's naval force, overran its coast-lands, defeated two of its armies, captured its capital (Lima), seized Bolivia's coast-land and nitrate-beds, and caused civil war and revolution in both Peru and Bolivia. The "peace" which was finally made (at Ancon, 1883, and Valparaiso, 1884) ceded to Chile the Peruvian province of Tarapaca,—a nitrate desert,—and the Bolivian department of Atacama; at the same time, Chile promised to retake the districts of Tacna and Arica from Peru and restore them to Bolivia. Having received the latter from Peru, on condition of holding a plebiscite of their inhabitants, at the end of ten years, Chile failed both to hold the plebiscite and to restore the disputed districts to Bolivia; hence "the Question of the Pacific" remained an open and ominous one. In President Coolidge's administration, a final attempt was begun by the United States to settle this question by conciliation: and, after a visit of friendship by President-elect Hoover to South America, the attempt proved successful, in so far as Chile and Peru are concerned. Bolivia still insists upon an "outlet" to the Pacific; but now that the dispute between Chile and Peru,—the most difficult and ominous in South America,—has been settled by the peace-method, there is excellent promise that Bolivia's grievance also will be assuaged by the same efficient means.

Colombia's wars with Venezuela, Ecuador and Panama have been wars of secession,—all of which have been successful; while the Central American wars have been wars of intervention and attempted annexations,—all of which have failed. Colombia's war with Panama was nipped in the bud by the naval forces of the United States, which was determined to secure the Canal Zone; and this armed intervention between Colombia and its rebellious daughter was a cause of dissension between Colombia and the United States for twenty years, until the United States finally agreed to a payment of \$25,000,000 as an indemnity for injuries inflicted and received.

The World War of 1914-18 caused much economic loss and anxiety to the Latin American republics, and gave a great impulse to the movement in favour of increasing their military and naval forces, of compelling all their male citizens to submit to military training and universal military service, and of promoting militarism in its various forms. When the United States entered the war, most of them broke diplomatic relations with Germany, a few of them declared war against her, and a few remained neutral. The only service which those that declared war could perform was in the contribution of foodstuffs and in handing over to the United States the German merchant-ships which had been interned in their ports.

Although the history of Latin America has been crowded with civil and foreign wars, it supplies also a large number of illustrations of the beneficence of the peace-method, whenever given a fair chance.

On one side of her scales, Latin America's Clio finds rebellion, secession, revolution, civil and foreign war, and all the vicious brood of evils which follow in their train: governmental inefficiency and dishonesty, social neglect, espionage, torture, proscription, assassination, massacre, exile, piracy, buccaneering, filibustering, banditry, greed for gold and guano, religious wars and conflicts, the inquisition, ignorance, superstition, poverty, vice, epidemics of yellow fever and other war-bred diseases, despotism, universal compulsory military training and service, competition in increase of armaments and the various chemical and mechanical means of destruction, intervention, annexation, conquest.

On the other side of the scales are the civilizing of the Indians, the prohibition of their enslavement, opposition to the sale of firearms and liquors to them, the emancipation of Negro slaves and the abolition of all human slavery (long before the United States took this step), the mastery of yellow fever and malaria (largely through aid from the United States), and a number of specific applications of

the peace-method, such as: mutual agreement, mediation and conciliation, international arbitration, an international court, the Monroe Doctrine, the Drago Doctrine, the Porter Proposition, international conference, political union, the League of Nations internationalism, the reduction and limitation of armaments, the Pan-American Union.

By mutual agreement, at least eight of the South American republics have settled a dozen or more boundary disputes, one of them (between Brazil and Colombia) lasting eighty years, another (between Ecuador and Colombia) sixty years, and another (between Brazil and Bolivia) nearly half a century. This last dispute seemed to be settled by treaty in 1867; but Brazilians pushed beyond the line agreed upon in search of rubber, and bloody battles ensued between these settlers and the Bolivians, until by another treaty in 1903 the coveted rubber lands were ceded to Brazil, while Bolivia was paid a sum of money and Brazil built a railroad around some cataracts in a river uniting the commerce of the two republics.

Mutual agreement settled also three disputes in which Paraguay was involved with the United States, France and England, respectively, after the three large powers had come to the verge of war with their little opponent. Another interesting illustration of peace by mutual agreement was when a civil war in Uruguay was ended by a compromise between the two factions which divided the offices of the republic between them!

By agreement, also, the Dominican Republic and Haiti gave to the United States the control over their finances; but the President and Senate of the United States had more difficulty in coming to an agreement with each other over ratifying these treaties than the three governments had in negotiating them!

Mediation and conciliation have been used, especially by the United States, to settle disputes in both South and Central America. The disastrous war of 1864-71, between Spain and Peru, Chile, Bolivia and Ecuador, was ended

through the mediation of the United States. The "War of the Pacific" between Chile and Peru and Bolivia (1879-84), the United States tried for many years and finally succeeded in ending by mediation. Central American wars participated in by all of the six republics have been prevented or ended by the mediation of the United States. In view of the success of the United States in Latin American mediation, it was appropriate for President Wilson to accept the proffered mediation of Argentina, Brazil and Chile in a dispute between the United States and Mexico, and to invite the coöperation of Argentine, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, Uruguay and Guatemala in mediating between two factions in Mexico and putting an end to their civil war.

International arbitration has also been most successful in settling disputes among the Latin Americans and between them and the Europeans. The dispute between Brazil and France over the boundary of French Guiana, which had lasted nearly two hundred years (1713-1900), was arbitrated by the President of Switzerland and resulted in Brazil's favour. The dispute between Brazil and Great Britain over the boundary of British Guiana, was settled by the arbitral award of the King of Italy, who gave half of the land in dispute to each claimant (1904). The boundary of Dutch Guiana was settled, without arbitration, by mutual agreement (1906).

The boundary between British Guiana and Venezuela gave rise to a very bitter controversy between the two countries, and finally brought Great Britain and the United States to the verge of war. Great Britain had taken its part of Guiana from Holland during the Napoleonic Wars, and British settlers pushed on into lands claimed by Venezuela as its own. After more than a half-century of controversy, and repeated refusals on the part of Great Britain to arbitrate, the United States issued an ultimatum demanding arbitration and threatening to decide the dispute itself and to enforce its decision. Fortunately, the British people favoured arbitration, the British government agreed to it,

and the result of the award was chiefly in Great Britain's favour.

Arbitration settled a boundary dispute between Argentina and Brazil, which was referred, after nearly a century of acrimonious debate, to the arbitral award of President Grover Cleveland (1895). The award was in favour of Brazil, but Argentina loyally accepted it.

The boundary line between Argentina and Chile was the subject of another long and dangerous dispute, in the course of which both sides increased and mobilized their armed forces in the land under dispute. War seemed so imminent in 1881, that the United States offered its mediation, and an agreement was made; but difficulties arose and the quarrel was renewed. This time the two countries agreed to submit the question to arbitration by the King of Great Britain, whose award was handed down in 1902, and accepted by both sides.

Argentina was itself asked to arbitrate a boundary dispute between Peru and Bolivia; its award was not considered satisfactory by either party, but they succeeded in settling it by mutual agreement. The boundary between Costa Rica and Colombia was arbitrated by the President of France (1900).

The King of Spain arbitrated the boundary between Ecuador and Peru, in 1888, and when this failed, he tried it again in 1904; on the latter occasion, however, he feared that war might result from the announcement of his award, and therefore withheld it, so that the boundary is still in dispute. The King of Spain was asked, meanwhile, to arbitrate the three-cornered line between Ecuador, Peru and Colombia (1894); but this award also was rejected by Ecuador.

A very important success of arbitration in preventing or ending war occurred in 1902, when Great Britain, Germany and Italy sent a fleet to blockade the coast of Venezuela for the purpose of collecting customs-dues for the payment of debts owed by Venezuela to their citizens. President

Roosevelt regarded this as ominous of danger to the Monroe Doctrine and as threatening genuine war, although the blockade was declared by its authors to be a "pacific" one. He accordingly induced the four powers concerned, as well as other European creditor-nations, to send the question of Venezuela's indebtedness to the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague. This court passed upon the claims against Venezuela, found them to be exorbitant, and awarded a very much smaller sum to the various creditors, whose governments accepted the award.

Again, when Nicaragua and Honduras were at war, in 1907, the United States and Mexico offered their joint mediation, and this led to the stopping of the war and to an agreement that their own and other Central American disputes should be settled by the arbitration of the Presidents of the United States and Mexico.

A more recent case of arbitration was that of the boundary dispute between Panama and Costa Rica, which brought the two countries to the verge of war (1910) but which, at the mediation of the United States, was submitted to arbitration by the Chief Justice of the United States. The award was handed down in 1914, but Panama objected to it and finally occupied a port in the territory awarded to Costa Rica (1920). War was again imminent; but when the United States insisted that the award should be lived up to, Panama yielded.

One difficulty in connection with Latin American arbitrations has been the actual surveying and marking of the line awarded. This difficulty has been overcome by the appointment of mixed commissions, such as that which succeeded in marking the line between Ecuador and Colombia, in 1916, sixty years after a paper-agreement regarding it had been made.

One noteworthy failure to resort to arbitration was President Roosevelt's rejection of Colombia's request to have the Panama Canal Zone dispute settled by the Hague Court of Arbitration. This refusal was followed by twenty

318 THE WAR-METHOD AND PEACE-METHOD

years of ill-feeling, until the United States agreed to the payment of \$25,000,000 to soothe the Colombians' injured feelings and to promote trade with them.

The great preponderance of success in the history of Latin American arbitration led all the American republics to adopt a Pan-American treaty providing for the obligatory arbitration of certain classes of disputes among them; and a much longer step was taken in the establishment of a *Court of Arbitration* for the Central American republics. Nicaragua and Honduras had just ended a war, through the mediation and arbitration of the United States and Mexico; and another war was about to break out between Nicaragua and Salvador (1907). President Roosevelt thereupon proposed that a conference of the five Central American republics should be held, with the aim of preserving peace and establishing justice among them. The conference was held at Washington, arbitration was agreed upon for all disputes, and a court was set up with the specific function of arbitrating them (1908). During the few years of this court's existence, it settled three disputes, and put an end to a civil war in one of the republics by issuing an injunction restraining the other republics from giving aid to the rebels. Most unfortunately, a treaty between the United States and one of the republics caused a decision of the court to become null and void, and it has been moribund since that time.

The Monroe Doctrine was issued in 1823 with the hope of preserving against Old World aggression the political independence and territorial integrity of the new republics of Latin America. Great Britain and other Old World powers have endorsed, and at times given active support to this doctrine; and with the growth of the Latin American powers they have claimed a share in the responsibility for enforcing it. Argentina, Brazil and Chile made a treaty in 1915 guaranteeing the doctrine, and in President Wilson's administration there was a strong movement in favour of a Pan-American assumption of responsibility for it. The two

Hague Conferences were officially notified of it, by the United States delegation; Article 21 of the Covenant of the League of Nations made an express reservation in its favour; and Article 10 of that Covenant endeavoured to apply its principles to all the world.

The Drago Doctrine, named after a publicist and statesman of Argentina, declares that force should never be used against a sovereign state for the collection of debts owed by that state; and it was vigorously and helpfully asserted in 1903 against the "peaceful blockade" of Venezuela by an Anglo-German-Italian fleet.¹ The Second Conference at The Hague, in 1907, adopted a proposition (called the Porter Proposition, after General Horace Porter of the United States delegation who championed it) agreeing that before force is resorted to for the collection of debts based on contract, such claims must be submitted to arbitration.

International conference is a form of the peace-method which has frequently been resorted to, and with very considerable success, by Pan-America. The Conference at Washington, in 1907, which established the Central American Court of Justice, has already been referred to. The six Pan-American Conferences, held in six American capitals since 1889, (and the four Pan-American Scientific Congresses) have accomplished much in themselves for the promotion of peace and coöperation among the twenty-one American Republics. The Pan-American Union which was established by the first of these conferences, with a beautiful headquarters building in Washington, has been in permanent operation between the conferences to promote the work of the conferences themselves.

More advanced than these conferences of delegates representing the republics, have been the attempts to bring about political union among some of them. While there is as yet no "United States of America" which includes all the republics in the Western World,—and which might be a strong incentive to a "United States of Europe,"—there

¹ See pages 315-6.

has been formed at several times a United States of Central America. The first Central American Union existed from 1823-39 (long enough to abolish slavery), but went down under the stress of politico-religious warfare and the ravages of the cholera. The second Union (1842-63) was broken up by a war between two of its member-states, Salvador and Guatemala. The next attempt at Union was made by a dictator of Guatemala, who tried to cement the five republics together by armed force, and who failed of course to achieve his object (1885). Ten years later, Honduras, Nicaragua and Salvador formed a Union, which was recognized by the United States, but which was broken up by a civil war in Salvador (1895). The Central American Court of Justice (1907)¹ was a judicial union of which all five of the republics were members. Finally, in 1921, another attempt at union was made, but Nicaragua was not included, Costa Rica rejected it, and a revolution in Guatemala broke it up. Perhaps these attempts, failures though they have been, may yet lead to the preservation of peace and the solution of other problems in Central America through the drastic method of political union,—an illustrious example for which has been set by the United States of America.²

The League of Nations, which includes nearly all the Latin American republics, is another interesting attempt at world-wide union or association. When it is amended so as to be a voluntary association, rather than a coercive alliance, and thus becomes a genuine application of the peace-method, all the world will doubtless join in it and make it the greatest of all steps thus far taken toward international government. The Dominican Republic has already appealed to the League of Nations against domination by the United States; and the Chile-Peru-Bolivia boundary dispute was brought before the League. But deference to the Monroe Doctrine caused the first appeal to be referred to the American government, which also brought about a con-

¹ See page 317.

² See pages 283-4.

ference in Washington between Chile and Peru, out of which came a solution of "the Problem of the Pacific."

Latin America has done its share toward the promotion of internationalism,—economic as well as political,—a few illustrations of which must suffice. Bolivia, as early as 1853, decreed that all Bolivian rivers emptying into the great rivers of the Amazon and Parana (which flow into the far-distant Atlantic) should be open to free navigation by the vessels of all nations. As early as 1884, the modern principle of the plebiscite (or the determination of national allegiance by vote of the people themselves) was agreed upon for the settlement of "the Problem of the Pacific." This agreement was, unfortunately, neglected; but the justice of this peace-method was emphasized both by its proposal and by its neglect in this dispute. Again, when the civilized world was shocked by reports of atrocities practised by a British corporation upon the Indians in the Putumayo rubber-districts of Peru, the British government promptly ordered an investigation of the reports and bowed to the world's public opinion by enforcing reforms.

Latin America affords a shining example, also, of the practicability and beneficent results of the reduction and limitation of armaments, which deserves to stand beside those supplied by the American-Canadian border, and by the Washington Conference of 1921-22. When the boundary between Argentina and Chile was finally arbitrated by the King of Great Britain, in 1902, after many years of threats and preparations for war, the two republics made a treaty which provided for the reduction and limitation of their armies and navies. They withdrew their troops from the border-land which had so often threatened war, and in their place they erected on the highest peak of the mountains a gigantic statue of the Prince of Peace ("The Christ of the Andes"), which should serve as a perpetual reminder to the two nations and the world that the peace-method of settling disputes between nations, as between individuals, is better than war.

II

THE WAR-METHOD: A SUMMARY

THE character, causes and results of the war-method may be clearly and abundantly understood through a consideration of it from the points of view both of experience and reason. The foregoing outline of the history of war, although necessarily very brief, should be sufficient to serve as a basis of consideration of the question from the point of view of experience.

By the practical man engaged in the world's real work, the *expense* of the war-method will probably be stressed as its outstanding characteristic. This expense consists in loss of wealth, both direct and indirect, and in loss of life. The direct expenditure of wealth on war by each generation may be estimated from the cost of the recent World War. The United States spent directly about one thousand dollars (\$1000) for each of its twenty-four million families. The direct cost to the world as a whole amounted to about six hundred dollars (\$600) for each of its three hundred and twenty million families.

These 186 billion dollars had to be borrowed or collected from taxes on productive business, and this has been true of the direct expenditures for all wars; hence the interest charge of each war rests on the shoulders of succeeding generations. This is the reason why the United States today is paying two-thirds of its entire national revenue for wars fought in the past. Before the World War, the British people were still paying \$120,000,000 a year for wars which had been fought a hundred years and more before 1914. In 1914, the British debt totalled three and a half billion dollars; after the war it totals nearly forty billion dollars, or more than one-third of Great Britain's entire national

wealth. The British people have been paying annually for a hundred years about seventy million dollars for the Napoleonic War of 1793-1815; for a century to come, they will be paying annually about one billion dollars for the World War of 1914-1918.

The last war of only four years, 1914-18, used up three billion dollars' worth of shipping, naval (800 war-ships) and mercantile (5,500 ships, 15 million tonnage), which had taken twenty-five years to accumulate; it destroyed thirty billion dollars' worth of property on land; it increased the national debts of the eight "Great Powers" from twenty-five to 250 billion dollars; it destroyed the labour of 6,660,000 ship-builders working 100 years, and necessitates the expenditure of \$250,000,000 per annum to replace the shipping loss; it deflected from productive industry capital and labour to such an extent as to increase the number of guns in Great Britain alone from 360 in 1915 to 5,000 in 1918, the monthly output of shells from 2,000 tons in 1914 to 155,000 tons in 1918;¹ it increased the number of labourers producing explosives in France from 6,000 in 1914 to 120,000 in 1917;² it increased the production of ammonia (for poison gases, etc.) in Germany from 25 tons a day in 1914 to 650 tons a day in 1918. Multiply these figures by three or four, for all belligerent nations, and the results are not only startling, but inconceivable by the unaided imagination.

Although wars in the past were fought on a smaller scale than the World War, they were more numerous, the populations engaged in them were smaller and the production of wealth was more difficult; so that each successive generation for the seven thousand years of recorded history has had to struggle with about the same relative burden of costs due to war. Each successive generation, too, carrying the burden

¹ 15,375,000 tons of steel, and the labour of 30,000 persons for about 100 years, represent the cost of the war in *shells* to Great Britain alone.

² 425,000 tons of a single explosive ("Poudre B") was used by France alone.

placed upon its back by its predecessors, has added to the burden bequeathed by it to its successors. Thus the generations of mankind have been linked each to each, not only by the blood-red thread of war itself, but also by the black rope of war's financial cost.

The last war caused the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of Europe's carefully treasured trees, and the deflection of building materials of every kind to the purposes of war; hence the shortage of dwellings which has been a world-wide tragedy during the past ten years; the enormous consumption of clothing materials by armies in the trenches and on the march is still causing millions of civilians to live in rags and tatters; the use of 60% of the world's steel for military purposes, and the devotion of labour equivalent to that of 1,000,000 workers, forty-four hours every week for 3,000 years, to purposes of destruction, go a long way to explain why the war plunged so large a part of the world into the depths of poverty and despair.

We have no accurate record of even the direct cost of war throughout the centuries. But it is known to have been for the twenty-three wars waged during the past 150 years \$212,707,183,337 and 15,506,873 human lives. The indirect expenditure of wealth on war cannot even be estimated in dollars and cents. This expenditure includes not merely the destruction of existing wealth (which amounted in the last war to thirty billion dollars), but the slowing down of useful production, and the divergence of capital and labour to the materials and processes of destruction. The enormity of this indirect loss can best be appreciated by reflecting on the greater advance in education, housing, the public health, and general social welfare and progress, which the expenditure of the vast sums spent on war would have caused if devoted to them. Its enormity and folly can be appreciated, also, when one reflects on the schools and colleges which could be endowed by the sums spent on a single battle, or even a single war-ship, and on the probability of preventing war by a proper attention to

education alone. How true and significant are Longfellow's words:

*" Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts."*

The cost of war in human life is a vast economic, as well as an incalculable moral loss. If the net cost to society of bringing a boy to maturity is about one thousand dollars, the economic loss due to killing or incapacitating the ten million dead and six million seriously wounded in the World War alone amounted to sixteen billion dollars. Not only did the world suffer this direct loss of capital invested in its youths and middle-aged men, but it has been deprived of probably an average of ten years' productive labour from each of the sixteen million direct victims of the war. To these must be added the indirect victims (of hardships and disease caused by the war) numbering perhaps twenty million more, making a total net loss of probably 360 million years of productive labour!

The individual and family loss and sorrow caused by war's fatality to human life cannot even be dreamed of; and the social loss consists far more in the destruction of the moral potentiality of war's victims than in the economic loss of their labour. It has been estimated that in every civilized population of 500,000 there has been about one man preëminent for some kind of ability. If the thirty-six million victims of the World War represent a population of twice that number, then there were probably about one hundred and fifty potentially preëminent men destroyed untimely by it. One hundred and fifty potential Lincolns, Edisons, Bells, Beethovens, Goethes, Marconis, Dantes, Tolstois, Pasteurs, Shakespeares, "village Hampdens" and "mute, inglorious Miltons," laid low by the war-chariot's scythe before their gifts of mind and soul had blossomed into fruitage!

The plain people, too, whom God must love, said Lincoln,

"because He made so many of them," have been immolated in unknown millions on the altar of Mars. The flower of our common manhood is seized and crushed by war, and the physical and mental calibre of posterity thereby decreased. The physically best are selected for death or wounds, insanity or crippling, and the next generation are largely the children of the relatively weaker. Hence war means, not merely the cradling and rearing of boys for mutual slaughter, but the bringing of those relatively less fit into the cradle and the school.

It might seem as if the case against war might end right here, in full certainty that the verdict of reason and humanity would go against it. But the half has never been and never can be told. Other counts in the indictment are its cruelty and inefficiency, its failure to accomplish desired results, its check to progress, and its manifold immoral results. Cruelty has accompanied it in all ages and among every people. The ferocity of Assyria's warriors; the nineteen million victims of Jenghis Khan; St. Bartholomew's Massacre; the Sicilian Vespers; Henry V's treatment of the citizens of Rouen; the September and Vendéan massacres of the French Revolution; Napoleon's massacre of his Syrian prisoners; the massacre of the Danes in England; Norman William's devastation of the Vale of York; the villainies of the Robber Barons; the Black Prince's butcheries in Southern France; the atrocities of border and Indian warfare; Irish wars of extermination; the brutalities of the Philippines conquest; the nameless and numberless barbarities committed in the white man's warfare against Africans, Asiatics and South Americans: such are a few samples of the black cloud of cruelty which has hovered over war in every continent and throughout the ages of human life down to our own day.

Not only is war cruel in itself and the breeder of fiendish cruelties, but it is hopelessly inefficient as well. Our great American Secretary of State, John Hay, was right when he declared that "war is the most *ferocious* and the most *futile*

of human follies." War has been waged at many times and by many peoples for the express purpose of "ending war." *This* war shall be the last war, has been the declaration and determination of nations, ancient, mediæval and modern. When the Persians had conquered Western Asia, they began a war against the Greeks to put an end to their constant invasions of Persian lands; but they merely succeeded in prolonging the war for a century and three-quarters, and in being themselves conquered by the Greeks at the end of it. The Greek Amphictyonies sought to *enforce* the peace among the Hellenic states, and only succeeded in stirring up centuries of civil war, which ended in the conquest of the Greeks, first by the Macedonians and then by the Romans. The Romans who had constantly prepared for war in order to preserve the peace (*Si vis pacem, para bellum*: "If you wish for peace, prepare for war"), throughout the twelve centuries of their independent history, were constantly engaged in war and were finally conquered by the "outside barbarians." The Frankish conquest of Western Europe, for the restoration of peace and civilization, was accompanied by ceaseless civil war, and ended in a thousand years of warfare (which may not even yet have been closed) between the two chief branches of the Frankish people, namely, the French and the German.

The way in which war invariably breeds more war, instead of ending it, is illustrated by innumerable examples. A few of these may be cited. To prevent Napoleon from using Denmark's fleet, Great Britain seized it, and thereby drove Denmark into an alliance with Napoleon. On Napoleon's fall, Denmark was compelled to give up Norway and be content with Schleswig and Holstein in return. To keep these provinces, Denmark fought four wars and finally lost them to Germany and Austria, who promptly fought each other for them; and when Germany and Austria were defeated in the World War, the peace-method of a plebiscite was finally resorted to for the permanent solution of the question. Prussia invaded France during the Revolution;

was conquered by Napoleon; with Austria's and England's aid, conquered France under the first Napoleon, and again under Napoleon III; invaded France again in the World War; was invaded by France in 1922-23; and the world is still left trembling before the possibilities of the future. Europe launched two centuries of Crusades against the Turks in Asia, and has been fighting the Turks in every century since, down to the World War and the war between Turkey and Greece which grew out of it.

While the Paris Conference was meeting in 1919, endeavouring to settle the problems of the World War which had just come to an end,—*the* war of all wars which was to have been the last war,—eighteen other petty wars broke out, and most of these are still smouldering sullenly and ominously in their ashes.

The story of Europe's shifting alliances reveals in a striking manner the inefficient, superficial character of war and the folly of striving to settle problems between nations by means of it. In the ancient world, the Jews allied themselves first with the Egyptians and then with the Mesopotamians and vice versa; but Palestine was overrun, and its people have been a subject or a fugitive nation during most of their history. The Hellenic states lined themselves up with Athens or with Sparta, in alliances or ententes resembling those of to-day; but war and ruin, not the preservation of peace and promotion of progress, were their common result. Rome's neighbours formed with her a triple alliance, which resulted in their own conquest.

In mediæval times, the Eastern Roman Empire summoned the Crusaders to its aid and lost to them its Asiatic provinces and finally its own independent existence. The Franks went to the aid of the Papacy, only to have their emperors and the popes engage in centuries of strife, which resulted in mutual disaster.

In mediæval and modern times, Turkey fought fourteen wars against one or more of the six great powers of Europe, and fought in alliance with all save Italy. Austria fought

twenty-eight wars against her six European neighbours, besides an extra quarter-century with Napoleonic France and two centuries with Turkey; but she has been in alliance a dozen times with all of them except Italy. Russia has been at war twenty-three times, and in alliance twenty-eight times, with all the European powers. Prussia has fought nineteen times against her neighbours, eighteen times in alliance with them: five times on England's side, twice against her; twice on the side of France, nine times against her. England has been allied twenty-two times, and at war thirty-odd times, with her Continental neighbours: three times she has fought against Russia, and five times as her ally; four times against, and four times in aid of, Austria; as an ally of France seven times, and a score of times against her,—including periods of 25, 100, 125, and 150 years of warfare against her!

How hypocritical has been the cry of "mad-dog nation," "criminal nation," "barbarous nation," which has been raised repeatedly by every European nation against each and all of its neighbours. And how futile have been the military alliances, as well as the wars, in which they have participated. The Numidians helped the Romans to tear the Carthaginians down, and were themselves devoured by the Roman wolf. The Eastern Roman Empire allied itself with the Crusaders against the Turks and with the Mongols against the Crusaders. While the Turks were hammering at the gates of Southeastern Europe, the Christian nations were fighting their own heretics, peasants, and one another, and even calling in the Turks to their aid. Poland and Venice came to the aid of the Western powers in the crises of their wars against the Turks, and were themselves conquered by Austria, Russia, Prussia and France. In the Nineteenth Century the kaleidoscope of the Great Powers' wars and diplomacy for and against Turkey is a labyrinthine maze which cannot be untangled here.¹ France and England fought on the side of Turkey against Russia and

¹ See pages 50-1.

Rumania, and then on the side of Russia and Rumania against Turkey. Swedish Protestants fought for German Protestants against German Catholics, and at the same time against Danish Protestants, who were aided by German Catholics. Spanish Christians received aid from Mohammedans of Morocco against the Mohammedans of Spain. Within a dozen years, Spain fought with and against France over Naples, next with France and the Pope against Venice, and then with the Pope and Venice against France. While French Catholics were fighting French Protestants, Spanish Catholics fought Catholic France and its allies, the Catholic Pope and the Mohammedan Turks. Italy fought on the French side against Austria, then joined Prussia against Austria, then entered the Triple Alliance with Austria and Germany against France and Russia, and finally fought on the side of France and Russia against Austria and Germany. The Austrians and Hungarians battled for centuries against the barbarous Turks in defense of civilized Europe, and in the World War called in the Turks to aid them in support of the German "Huns" against civilized Europe. A Franco-Turkish fleet bombarded and destroyed the Catholic city of Nice, and an army of Catholic Spaniards and Germans captured and destroyed a large part of Papal Rome. Austria fought and ruled Italy for centuries, and was defeated and ejected from the German family by Prussia, but joined in the Triple Alliance with both of them; while Great Britain having fought France for centuries and entered into a desperate imperialistic rivalry with Russia, formed the Triple Entente with them. The mediæval cities fought with the kings against the barons, and then saw their own self-government swallowed up in the royal absolutism. The French drove the Spaniards from Italy, were themselves driven out by the Italians, formed an alliance with the Spaniards against the Italians and conquered them, then quarrelled and fought with the Spaniards, and were again driven out by the Spaniards and Italians: all within ten years! The French suppressed a revolt in Corsica at the

request of the Italians, then kept it for themselves, and a generation later were themselves subjected to a Corsican bandit's despotism and were led by him through a quarter-century of slaughter to ultimate defeat. During the Wars of Religion, French Catholics fought against Spanish and Austrian Catholics, in aid of German Protestants, and against French Protestants. England aided Austria against Prussia and France, then aided Prussia against France and Austria,—also within ten years. All Europe, including Spain, fought France throughout the Napoleonic era, and then joined France against Spain, eight years after Napoleon's fall. France and Great Britain fought Turkey in behalf of the Balkan states, supported Turkey in several wars against Russia, and finally joined Russia in a war against Turkey, only to quarrel with each other over the carving-up of Turkey, and finally permitting Turkey to come back into Europe almost as strong as ever and threatening an alliance with Russia against them, or with the French against the British!

The Scots allied themselves with the French for three hundred years and fought against England in all the wars of those centuries; and then united with England and fought on England's side against France and the rest of the world. During the Civil Wars in England, the Scots fought against the king, then against the parliament, then for the king, and finally against the king, until political union put an end to the folly. England fought Spain in a desperate war to keep a Bourbon king from the Spanish throne, and a century later fought another desperate war allied with the Spanish people to retain the Bourbons on the Spanish throne. England fought on Holland's side against Spain to secure Dutch independence, and then fought three wars against Holland to prevent Dutch rivalry on the seas. The Dutch fought England, while fighting France, then became allies of the English against the French, then joined the French against England, and finally were called upon to fight against both France and England. The English in

alliance with Austria fought against the Prussians, and then within ten years in alliance with the Prussians they fought against the Austrians.

The Americans fought with England against the French for a hundred and fifty years; then in alliance with France, fought England in the Revolutionary War; then fought the French, while the French were fighting England; then fought the English, while England was fighting against the French and the Napoleonic despotism; and finally (?) fought on the side of England and France against the Germans. England's alliance with Japan against the Russians and French was changed into an alliance with the Russians and French against the Germans, and then became such a menace in the eyes of the Americans that it had to be abrogated to prevent a war between the Americans and the British and Japanese. The Americans fought a little war with Mexico and took from it so much new land that a gigantic Civil War was fought among the Americans themselves to prevent the extension of slavery to the lands thus acquired.

The folly of war and of alliances in preparation for war might be illustrated by countless other incidents in the history of nearly every people; but enough of these incidents have been cited to prove "to the hilt" the truth of John Hay's severe indictment of war as "the most ferocious and the most futile of human follies." Its futility is best seen, perhaps, in its attempts to achieve great steps in civilization, or to prevent a return to barbarism. For example, the Greeks conquered the *Ægeans* and fought the "barbarian" Persians, and ended by being caught up in the superior *Ægean* and Persian culture. The Romans annihilated the Etruscans and the Greeks of Southern Italy, from whom they had received the rudiments of civilization, conquered the Greeks of Greece proper and the Near East, and handed on to our own time the civilization of the Greek peoples whom they had conquered. The Roman Empire struggled for centuries against "the despicable Christians" and "the

barbarous Teutons," and ended by being transformed into Christian, Teutonic kingdoms. Mediæval Europe fought for centuries against the "infidel Saracens and Moors" (in Syria, Sicily and Spain), and received the most effective impulses to its civilization from them. The "barbarous Northmen" carried to the more genuinely barbarous English the best elements of Norman culture and Danish literature, after generations of English resistance. The Crusaders and the Eastern Roman Empire beat down the Mohammedan Arabs and Seljuk Turks, only to give opportunity for the Ottoman Turks to conquer Western Asia and Southeastern Europe; Poland and Venice which had fought against the Turks to protect Austria and Europe against them, were conquered by their European allies and divided up among them; while the nations which received this loot were fighting against France (the conqueror of Venice) in order to "defend humanity against revolutionary violence and socialistic anarchy"! Protestant Sweden and Denmark fought each other while aiding Protestant Germans against Catholic Germans, and Sweden and Russia fought each other while aiding Protestant Prussia and Catholic Austria against Catholic France. The Spaniards fought the Moors and Jews for eight centuries in Spain, meanwhile receiving the chief part of their civilization from their "infidel foes," and finally conquered and expelled them, with the result of a relapse into religious bigotry, cruelty, superstition and imperialistic aspirations which have made their nation a fourth-rate power, and involved it in endless and fruitless wars, four centuries later, with the Moors in Morocco. The Spanish king, endeavouring to restore Catholicism in Western Europe, fought against Protestant England and Holland, Catholic France and the Papacy, and the Mohammedan Turks, all at one and the same time. Christian Emperors and Christian Popes fought each other for temporal supremacy, during centuries, only to bring to nought both Empire and Papacy as temporal powers, to nullify the Crusaders' attempt to recapture the Holy Land, and to make South-

eastern Europe the prey of the Turks. The Emperors, while striving to suppress the Protestants of Germany, captured and looted Papal Rome, at the same time fighting a half-dozen wars with Catholic France and its Turkish allies. Catholic France, having crushed its own Protestant heretics in a series of ten bitter bloody wars, came to the aid of the German Protestants in the equally bitter and bloody Thirty Years' War. Austria and Prussia fought together in many wars against France, then fought each other in several other wars, which ended in Austria being put out of the German union by Prussia,—to the great indignation of France; and after the two countries were allied and defeated in the World War by France and its allies, they are forbidden by the victors to form the union which they themselves now ardently desire! The Hungarians fought for centuries, first for the Austrians against the Turks, then vice versa, and finally with both the Austrians and the Turks against the Slavs of Russia and the Balkans; while the Slavs, who had been "saved" by the Hungarians from the Turks, turned against them when they were struggling to win their independence of Austria, and during and since the World War have been Hungary's most implacable foes. Germany protected France for centuries against the Slavic invasions, only to see the Slavs become the most important Continental allies against her in the World War; but since the war, the chief fear of the French has been that the Slav and the Teuton will become allied against them.

As a defender and promoter of progress,—that is, of religion, democracy, industry, science, human welfare and happiness,—could anything be more futile than war? On the contrary, all history proves that the war-system and the war-method have been the chief *foe* of progress. The history of men from the earliest times thunders a terrible indictment of war as the chief obstacle to human advancement. The primordial and unending toil of the myriads of human labourers, and the contributions made to civilization by ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, and their successors in the

task of building up human culture, have all been largely wasted in the sacrifices offered up on the altars of Moloch, Mars, and many another man-made God of War. Lands which to-day, thanks to the bounty of kindly Mother Nature and the toil of industrious men, should blossom like the rose, lie buried in desert sand or starve from lack of cultivation in the midst of a seething cauldron of incessant war and preparations for more war. Mesopotamia, the Balkans, Belgium, Spain, Italy, Toulouse, France, the Vale of York, and many another part of the kindly earth supply sad and abundant proofs of war's blighting effects. Oases of peace and progress accentuate the more war's deserts of retrogression. Among these stand out the Roman provinces, under the Pax Romana; Scandinavia's four centuries of union and comparative peace; Holland's rapid ascent, when her people had only the waters of her rivers and sea to cope with, and not human invaders or subject peoples; Spain, after awakening from its dream of empire beyond seas; the Plain of Lombardy, when it was not used as "the cockpit of Europe"; England and America, immune from foreign invasion.

Even where civilization has made rapid progress, how grossly it has been perverted to the uses of war by the militarism which has but too frequently accompanied it! Ancient Macedonia under Philip and Alexander; the Mongols of mediæval times; Germany after its military successes and during its marvellous industrial progress since 1870; modern Japan, absorbing so eagerly Western culture and Western worship of "military efficiency": such are some of the many illustrations of national attempts to serve two masters, the God of Peace and the God of War.

What priceless masterpieces of human genius have shared, with the fruits of human toil, the senseless and criminal destruction caused by war. Most of antiquity's "wonders of the world" have been ground into dust under war's iron heel. The Parthenon of Athens,—that miracle in marble,—was destroyed by a bomb hurled by Venetian Christians

against the "barbarous" Turks; Rome's architectural and sculptural treasures have been largely destroyed by Christian siege and sack; the Hundred Years' War, the Thirty Years' War, the Civil Wars in England, Louis XIV's and Napoleon's raids, the Germans in the World War, have all destroyed priceless treasures of literature, science and art. Thus war has done its utmost to destroy the amenities of human life, those rare gifts of the spirit which adorn and beautify man's upward climb, as well as to destroy the rounds of the ladder upon which through centuries of toil he has sought to rise above the bare necessities into the comforts of his common life on earth.

How preposterous that man's great adventure here on earth should be handicapped by man's own folly in fighting, maiming, killing his fellow-man. The storms, earthquakes and other devastations beyond man's control have scourged him in peace and in war. Indeed, they have made puny and absurd some of the greatest of warlike expeditions. The monsoon which overwhelmed the Mongols invading Japan; equatorial heat and the growth of the jungle into a rain-forest which buried the proudest culture of pre-Columbian America; the tempest-tossed Armada of Spain whose invincibility disappeared when cast away on the crags of Scotland and Ireland; the storms which nullified repeated French expeditions to Scotland and Ireland; the fever which laid low Alaric and his Goths, and caused Attila and his Huns to beat a hasty retreat from Italy's fatal valleys; the "plagues" which drove the English from Spain, under the Black Prince, and from France, in Elizabeth's time; the floods which broke through Holland's dykes and drowned many of its towns; the earthquake which devastated Portugal's capital; the Black Death which repeatedly visited Western Europe and in a single visitation carried off from one-half to two-thirds of its inhabitants; the snows of Alpine mountains and the rigours of Russia's winter, which wiped out Napoleon's "Grand Armies" like the leaves of autumn before wintry blasts; the tempest which dashed

asunder the belligerent ships of Germany, America and Britain on the coast of Samoa; and so on and on through the centuries down to our own day, when the world stood stunned before the pestilence and famine which killed more Russians after the World War than the soldiers who died in the war itself, and before the earthquake and fires which destroyed the capital and naval base of Japan,—one of the modern world's "great powers": such are a few of the natural catastrophes which laugh to scorn the puny pride of martial men, and make ridiculous to the verge of insanity their efforts at mutual destruction.

How transient, too, have the mightiest of empires been made by war. Jesus of Nazareth, walking to and fro in Syria and looking round upon the ruins of military powers which had risen and fallen, one after the other for five thousand years, and on the all-pervading Roman Empire of his time which gloried in its military omnipotence, might well proclaim the great lesson of history that "they who take the sword shall perish by the sword." The lion and the lizard were even then the successors of the Sargons, the Tiglath-Pileasers, the Sennacheribs and Nebuchadnezzars of Sumeria and Akkad, Chaldæa, Assyria and Babylonia, while the sands of the desert had buried deep the bricks which recorded their military triumphs and the temples which sought to commemorate their victories in war. Proud Rome, too, was to prove to the hilt the truth of his prophecy, impossible though it seemed to his contemporaries.

How hopeless and helpless has war proved itself again and again and forever in the permanent and righteous reform of individual and social evil. The Roman plebeians' attempt at democracy by fighting loyally the wars of their Senate ended in the oligarchy of their military aristocrats and the imperial despotism of their military generals. The Crusades against the "infidel" Turk and Jew did not regain the Holy Land or root out heresy, but brought destruction upon the Eastern Roman Empire and impoverishment of body and soul upon Western Europe. Centuries of war

against the Turks in Europe have left a trail of massacre and ruin in all neighbouring lands, a heritage of imperialistic rivalry and warfare to the great powers of Western Europe, and the Turkish power apparently stronger than ever astride the straits connecting Europe and Asia. The Bulgars, Magyars and Serbs, with whose barbarism the highly civilized Eastern Roman Empire struggled for centuries, have outlived that Empire by nearly five hundred years, and are still the cause of great solicitude as well as of rivalry and warfare among the highly civilized powers of to-day. The Balkan lands which strove for centuries by means of the sword to repel the Turks, have fought each other fiercely and even allied themselves with the Turks in their warfare,—all in the name of making the Balkans safe for civilization and Christianity. Religious wars in Switzerland, Germany, France, Belgium and Holland, Asia and Africa, for the eradication of Catholicism or Protestantism or Mohammedanism, have made the enemy religion all the stronger, or caused the triumph of irreligion. Social revolts in England, France, Germany, Russia, for the abolition of serfdom were met by bloody military repression, and when they ended, the invincible power of peaceful economic law swept serfdom away forever. Napoleon's repression of "the German peril," by victories and garrisons, resulted in two conquests of France and the continued existence of "the German peril" in ever more virulent form. Bismarck's plan of welding German union by blood and iron in victories over Prussia's neighbours helped to create the worst war in history and after going down to the very depths of defeat has been hanging in the balance between secession and separation, on one hand, a communistic or monarchistic dictatorship, on the other, with military domination by France and her allies in the background. The wars of the French kings against the Albigensian heretics caused the blood of the martyrs to become the seed of the Church and paved the way for the rise of the heretic Huguenots; and the wars against these caused France to lose many thousands of her best people

and to strengthen the Protestantism which was left behind. Joan of Arc, appealing in the name of the Christian religion to the military ardour of the French people, found herself forsaken by them and handed over to the English enemy to die a fiery death at the stake, and left a trail of military glory behind her which has done much to pervert the Christianity of France into a religion of warfare. England, fighting a hundred and fifty years' war to protect her American colonies against the French, lost those colonies by another war within a score of years after her "stupendous victories" over the French. The French, seeking democracy by the military route, suffered a half-dozen revolutions, several attacks of imperialistic autocracy and radical tyranny, and many foreign wars, and found it only in the eclipse of her military "glory" under the shadow of the victorious eagles of Germany. After two hundred years of bloody warfare against the Danes, including an attempted massacre of all the Danish invaders, the English yielded to a Danish king, who greatly promoted England's welfare and Anglicized his own Danish followers. After fighting desperately against the Norman invaders, England submitted to Norman rule, and now looks back upon it as the greatest turning-point in her history.

After three hundred years of bloody warfare in an effort to conquer Scotland, England united with the Scotch on equal terms and has been largely governed by them ever since. After seven centuries of still bloodier warfare in an effort to conquer Ireland, England concedes Ireland's right to be a Free State and even to become a full-fledged member of the League of Nations. The Lollards were suppressed by the sword and burned at the stake, but saw their policy and doctrines triumph a century later under the leadership of the government that had persecuted them. The Peasants were ruthlessly crushed by armed force, but attained their goal by the aid of economic forces far more powerful than any wielded by soldier or politician. Catholic Mary and Spanish Philip sought to stamp out Protestantism in Eng-

land by military threat and burnings at the stake, and succeeded only in converting the bulk of English Catholics to Protestantism. Charles I's wars to compel the Scotch to accept Episcopalianism resulted in civil wars in England which cost Charles his crown and his head, overthrew Episcopalianism in England for a time, and set the Presbyterians and Independents to fighting one another. James II's attempt to restore Catholicism by force resulted in a bloodless revolution which deposed him, destroyed the supremacy of the crown in the government, and brought religious toleration to everybody. During the French Revolution, when the British Government was fighting France abroad and endeavouring to crush at home freedom of speech, assembly and the press, British juries rejected the method of bloodshed, and these great rights of Englishmen were established more firmly than ever.

After a hundred years of terribly destructive but inconclusive war between England and France, the spirit of nationality and union was breathed into the French people by the inspired enthusiasm of a simple peasant girl; Joan of Arc was soon burned at the stake by her English captors, but the spirit which her faith had enkindled brought to nought the victories of Crécy and Agincourt. The English did their utmost, with the aid of the Germans, to conquer the French under Napoleon I, and rejoiced over the German conquest of France under Napoleon III; and then within an even shorter time, joined with the French in the World War to conquer the Germans.

The Americans fought for a century and a quarter with the English against the French, then with the French against the English, then against both the French and the English, and finally with the French and the English against the Germans. The War of 1812 against the British did not achieve the main objects for which the Americans went to war, but these were achieved a few years later when the British threatened war against the Americans unless they were conceded! The Americans fought a war against Great

Britain, for one reason among others that the mother country had fixed the system of slavery upon her colonies; then, Great Britain abolished the slave trade and emancipated the slaves in all her colonies; a few years later, the Americans fought the Mexicans in defense of slavery in Texas and for the acquisition of more slave territory; and within a dozen years after this they were fighting each other for the extension or abolition of slavery within their own lands! The war for the freedom of the slaves was followed by an attempt to confer political and civil equality upon the Negroes by a further show of force; and the result of this was a failure to secure them in the possession of these rights, and the creation of a Negro Problem which still arrays the North against the South and the Negroes against the Whites.

Some wars, it is true, have been followed by good to mankind. Fortunately for man, God can and does bring good out of evil. But woe unto that man or nation who resorts to evil, even for the purpose of achieving good results. The end does *not* justify the means. Heaven's laws must not be broken even to achieve Heaven's ends. And how ferocious war is in itself; how futile it is to achieve thoroughly good and permanently good results; how infinitely inferior it is to great moral or even economic laws to solve problems aright,—these lessons are written large by millenniums of warfare in the past.

When we turn to the positive results of war, we find that it is utterly condemned. Abroad, it has been for centuries the agent and provocation of imperialistic rivalry. By and upon war flourished the imperialism of ancient Egypt, Chaldaea, Babylonia and Persia, which fought one another for imperialistic supremacy throughout the infancy and youth of civilization. By Rome's imperial legions, immersed in the blood of countless victims, Rome's imperialistic supremacy swept around the Mediterranean world. Throughout the mediæval centuries the imperial rivalries of Germany, France, Spain and England, kept Europe's armies constantly

on foot and Europe's people and wealth continually under the heel of royal rivals who fought, not one another unfortunately, but one another's subjects, for military glory and despotic power. In modern times, France and England have fought for supremacy upon and beyond the seas; Russia and England have made Central Asia the theater and goal of their struggles for empire; Spain, Portugal, Holland and Belgium have been led into wars with one another or with the larger powers to maintain the imperialistic claims which they had staked out in America, Asia or Africa; Russia, Japan, France and England have resorted repeatedly to war for pushing their imperialistic ambitions at the expense of China; while the determination of the Germans and the French to dominate the continent of Europe by their imperial power has precipitated a half-dozen of the worst wars in human history, without permanently achieving their object, but with the result of causing the pendulum of power to swing back and forth, to and fro, in weary repetition, and of bringing the Western World and finally the whole world to the brink of ruin.

War as the agent of imperialistic rivalry became naturally the cause of universal, compulsory military training and service. Dazzled or frightened by such militaristic policies as those of ancient Sparta, or Revolutionary France, or modern Prussia, the nations have vied with one another in devoting the time, wealth, resources and inventiveness of their people to preparations for war. Some parts of the earth have been converted into armed camps, the ocean-lanes have been crowded with battle-ships, while the submarine and the aeroplane have enabled men to carry their preparations for mutual slaughter by means of high explosives and poisonous gas beneath the seas and toward the sky. The extent and significance of preparing for war in time of peace may be indicated by a few statistics. During the fifteen years before the War of 1914-18, the eight great powers built 1,719 war-ships, of 5,654,000 tonnage; their expenditures for military preparedness totalled 30 billion dollars.

During the twenty-one years from 1900 to 1920 these countries spent for war preparations and the war they prepared for 300 billion dollars; while for all other purposes they spent 230 billion dollars! This latter sum includes large payments for interest on war-debts and for heavy military pensions, which should properly be deducted from civilian and added to military expenditures. The national debts during these twenty-one years increased from 20 billion dollars to 265 billion dollars, and this increase was due almost entirely to preparations for war and the war which was prepared for.

During this period of huge and unprecedented expenditures, the world was assured that in this way only could war be prepared *against*; and the taxpayers meekly bore their military yoke in that belief. Was war prevented? No! The worst war in human history followed this preparation for war as surely as the harvest follows the seed-time. But not even yet is the world cured of its insane folly of military preparedness. There are more men in the armies of Europe to-day than there were in 1913 in anticipation of the World War; and the annual military expenditures of Europe (excluding Germany) are one-half billion dollars *more* in 1929 than in 1913,—ten years after “the war to end war”! Even the United States has increased its military expenditures (exclusive of pensions) from \$300,000,000 to \$658,000,000! The percentage of the national income which goes to pay for past wars and for preparation “against” future wars amounts in Great Britain to 70%, in France to 70%, in the United States to 80%!

In the cemeteries of Europe to-day there are millions of crosses which mark the graves of the victims of the world's worst delusion that “if you wish for peace, you must prepare for war.” Are our preparations for war to-day sowing the crop of other millions of crosses which shall mark the graves of future victims of this blind and insane folly?

The ancient and mediæval device of recruiting military strength by hiring mercenary troops from abroad, has been

discarded; but in our time, when a levy *en masse* of an entire nation for purposes of war is deemed insufficient, the "colonials" are called upon to aid the "mother country." By this device, millions of "backward" men, black, brown and yellow, in the imperial hunting-grounds of Africa and Asia, are being corralled, equipped and trained for effective participation in wars to be waged by their "enlightened" white rulers. And even the *democracies* of Europe and America, which have dreaded compulsory military training and the draft as the greatest menace to their fundamental spirit and institutions, have become inoculated with the prevalent disease of militarism and have either resorted to, or are being stampeded into, the use of these effective methods of causing war and of stifling liberty.

Since the spirit of man is more precious than all of his possessions or activities, the worst evil caused by the war-method in times both of war and peace is its *moral damage*. This damage is manifold, and is inflicted upon both the soldier and the civilian,—man, woman and child.

The soldier's training, if it be entirely adequate for the performance of his prime function, namely, that of human slaughter, sets military discipline and obedience above even his religious convictions, exalts the things that are Cæsar's above the things that are God's; servile obedience to "superior" officers, from corporals up to kaisers, eclipses all normal human virtues; loyalty to the regiment, the uniform, the flag, the army, swallows up all other loyalties, both lower and higher; deliberate training in the arts of violence, while regimental chaplains ply *their* trade upon him, makes of him a conscious or unconscious hypocrite, striving both to pray like a saint and fight like the devil. Idleness, or a ceaseless round of unproductive activity, wine, women and wassail, wholesale harlotry and venereal disease, cause a barracks to be regarded as a worse neighbour than a prison or a cemetery. Deliberate, "scientific" falsehood; the meanest kinds of espionage and treachery; looting, burning, torturing of prisoners to secure information or for revenge;

indifference to human death and suffering; the thrill or drunkenness of spirit which comes from the excitement of "the chase" after human prey on the field of battle, and causes these "hunters of men" to "see red"; the suspension of reason; the suppression of conscience; the liberation of the human beast from the control of human culture; all these things and many more produce in a prolonged and thoroughgoing army life either butchers or cowards; and the comparatively few real heroes who come through the furnace unscathed can never begin to atone for the vast majority whose moral natures are debased. "Demoralized by the war," "shell-shocked": such are the sad epitaphs written large over the ruined lives of millions of victims of the war-method when that method really means "*force, force, to the uttermost!*"

It is the Great Stupidity, the Inexcusable Lie, which declares that the war-method promotes manliness and chivalry among men. While it enables some men to practise, in spite of enormous odds, the virtues of endurance, devotion and physical and moral courage which have been cultivated in them during years of civilian life, its own contribution is the denial of pity, humility, mercy, purity, love; it is the promotion of ruthlessness, among fighters, and especially among the readers and hearers of the fights; it is the wholesale slandering of the enemy, of his whole nation, of their entire history; it is that "bias of patriotism" which refuses to permit the truth to be spoken of "the foe," but demands that scorn, wrath and hatred unadulterated shall be poured upon his head; it is the copious source of an egregious self-conceit in individuals and in nations, which insists on their superiority in everything and their invulnerability to defeat; it is the cause of a loss of poise which takes, in time of war, many ludicrous, weird and terrible forms of lunacy and insanity; it is the fruitful mother of moral cowardice based on fear, of covetousness, vulgarity, pauperism, vagrancy, vice and crime. Representing as it does the union of Moloch and Mammon, War and Wealth, its children are

branded with the vices of both parents, and are the germ-carriers of national decay.

To the children of our race, the war-method is a peculiarly frightful and ferocious burden. Beginning in the nursery, soldier toys and games do what they can to give a military bent to the infantile mind. In school, war-books, defense-essays, ballads of battle, songs of victory and hatred, the fetich of the flag, the worship of military heroes, military training, do their utmost to teach youths how to kill other youths before they themselves have learned how to live. One of the greatest triumphs of democracy has been the achievement of universal education; but militarism has captured the schools from democracy and made them the training and recruiting grounds of soldiers, who menace education and democracy alike. War-book shelves in public libraries, the city arsenals of national guards, even the church with its boys' brigades, lie in wait for the feet of our youth to lead them into the path of militarism, where the eternal principles of truth taught in infancy at the mother's knee are abhorred, denounced, and replaced by their opposites.

In time of war, and in peace-time preparations for war, the fundamentals of democracy, namely, freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, are repressed; journalism is enslaved; business is shot through with profiteering and economic imperialism; patriotism is debased and made indeed "the last refuge of scoundrels"; social reforms are starved or thwarted; the missionary's message of Christianity to the heathen is backed up by bullets and the menace of the mailed fist; and the Christian pulpit is devoted to the task of making *this* war or the next one holy. Thus from the cradle to the grave, the children of men are hounded by the dogs of war and their running-mates, those of war-born pestilence and famine. Such is a partial and wholly inadequate indictment of the war-method; and every item in the indictment has been proved by mountains of incontrovertible facts in the war-method's history.

III

THE PEACE-METHOD: A SUMMARY

SO FUTILE, so ferocious, so horrible in every way is war, that belief in an all-wise and all-loving God is an impossibility if we are obliged to believe also that war is inevitable in the settlement of human affairs. But this latter belief is a denial of divine providence and a blasphemy against God Himself. He who proclaimed from Mount Sinai, Thou shalt not kill, and from Mount Calvary, Thou shalt love thy enemy, has not left men without an alternative to war. There *is*, and has long been, a peace-method, for the sane and efficient settlement of disputes among nations as among individual men. The lack of a will to use that method, ignorance of its possibilities and achievements, and a blind and timorous clinging to the hoary iniquity of the war-method, are responsible for the fact that the peace-method is not habitually and universally used, to the utter exclusion and rejection of war and of all preparations for it.

This peace-method has many aspects, some of which have become antiquated and undesirable in our time. Among the latter may be mentioned the inclusion of all nations within a single world-empire, and the building up of "Chinese walls of exclusion." The attempts of Alexander of Macedon and of the Roman emperors to diffuse a single civilization throughout the world, to amalgamate all nations into a single world-type, and to bring them under a single world-government, proved impossible in their times and run counter to our modern belief in the desirability of numerous, diverse nations each working out its own salvation in its own way, and each contributing its best gifts to the promotion of a rich and varied human progress. The nationalism of our

time must not be permitted, on the other hand, to degenerate into an ultra-nationalism, contemptuous of and hostile to the national ideals and achievements of other peoples, but must be founded on mutual understanding, respect and coöperation. This necessity, in a time when all the world has been brought together into a single neighbourhood by the marvellous development of means of communication and by economic and moral interdependence, is a sufficient reason why another old ideal, namely, that of national seclusion, is neither possible nor desirable. Walls of exclusion, whether like that of mediæval China, or like those of modern prohibitive tariffs and drastic immigration laws, are injurious both to the would-be hermit nation and to the rest of the world.

Another form of the peace-method has been tried in the absorption of invading hosts by the "conquered" population. Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia were invaded again and again by "victorious" armies, whose soldiers were speedily absorbed in the populations and civilization of the people whom they thought they had conquered. China, too, has dealt thus successfully through the centuries with the hordes of Mongols and other forgotten peoples who have ventured within her magic circle. The Greeks in Asia, under Alexander's successors, the Gauls and Teutons penetrating into the Roman Empire, the Northmen invading mediæval Europe, the Bulgars and Slavs swarming into the Eastern Empire, the Arabs pressing into Northern Africa and other old haunts of Græco-Roman culture, the Saxons and the Franks, the Slavs and the Germans, the Danes and the English, all furnish interesting historic illustrations of this conquest of "conquerors" by the irresistible peace-method of absorption. Even in our modern United States, the millions of Germans, Slavs, Italians, etc., who have come to our shores as immigrants have vastly outnumbered any host of warriors who have ever invaded the land of another people, and these too have been assimilated into our population and body politic, accepting some of our ideals and

achievements and contributing beneficent ideals and achievements of their own to our common "Americanism."

Political union, by mutual agreement, has been another form of the peace-method which has been applied on a wide scale and with remarkable success. The union of Norway, Denmark and Sweden for a century and a quarter, and then of Norway and Denmark for another century; the union of the cantons of Switzerland into a federal republic; the repeated reunions of Austria, Hungary and Bohemia in the face of a common foe and of mutual conflict; the union under the Danes of England, Norway and Denmark, and under the Normans and Angevins of England, Normandy and a large part of France; the union of the German states, and of the provinces of Italy; and, most important of all, the union of the Thirteen (now forty-eight) States in the American Republic: these are some of the many historic illustrations of the establishment and maintenance of peace through political union of former foes or rivals by mutual agreement.

The success of this form of the peace-method is accentuated by the contrary attempts to bring about political union, without mutual agreement and by force of arms. Sweden compelled an unwilling Norway to accept Swedish sovereignty, after Napoleon's fall; but was obliged by economic and political forces to agree, a century later, to Norway's peaceful secession and independence. A similar attempt of the French Revolutionists to annex Holland, and of Holland to annex Belgium, came likewise to a speedy and appropriate end. England's repeated attempts to annex Wales by conquest ended in a successful union on judicial, legal, political and social equality. England's long and persistent wars for the annexation of Scotland came to nought; but when a voluntary political union on terms of equality was offered, the centuries-old problem was peacefully and adequately solved. For seven hundred years, England endeavoured to coerce Ireland to accept English domination, by means of war and manifold forms of violent

compulsion; and now after complete failure and untold miseries during those centuries, it has adopted the wise and statesmanlike peace-method of voluntary concession and mutual agreement.

The early Christians, the Bohemian Brethren, the Anabaptists, Schwenkfelders, Mennonites, Collegiants, Moravians, Dunkers, Doukhobors and Quakers, all furnish conclusive evidence of the success of that extreme form of the peace-method which is known as passive resistance, when it has been resorted to by individuals or groups of men whose souls are sustained in times of persecuting violence by a robust and implicit religious faith.

So obviously futile, expensive and wicked has the war-method appeared that even nations and nationalities have adopted this extreme form of the peace-method. The Jews, after their dispersion from their national home in Palestine, became fugitives in many lands and suffered centuries of attack, persecution, and expulsion from the peoples among whom they lived; and yet, by a passive resistance founded upon an unconquerable religious conviction, they were enabled to withstand the persecuting storms of centuries, to increase in numbers, and to flourish in all the essential elements of civilization and progress. When the avalanche of Huns came down into the plains of Italy, the peasants and townsmen did not resist them, but held fast to their soil and the islands of the Adriatic, while the tempest was expending its short-lived fury; and the historic city of Venice, founded by poor fugitives, has survived for fourteen centuries after the Hunnish hordes disappeared into oblivion. While the other Slavs resisted the Turkish attack and were compelled to yield to the Turkish yoke, the Montenegrins held grimly to their mountain fastnesses while the storm rolled over them and were never really subjected to Turkish rule. Many a town in mediæval Europe bought the right of exemption from attack and government by its feudal lord, and these towns have flourished for centuries after the corpse of feudalism was laid in its grave.

No great modern nation has as yet been willing to venture its existence upon the use of passive resistance to armed invaders; but the Indian followers of Gandhi and the people of the Rhineland and the Ruhr have recently engaged with notable success in this interesting experiment. Meanwhile, various nations have been willing to sacrifice their national ambitions to their sense of justice in dealing with others. For example, Sweden peacefully conceded Norway's demand for independence, and Great Britain has given Ireland and her colonists in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa political autonomy. Denmark, after the defeat of Germany in the World War, refused to demand the cession of Holstein to her, and declined to hold a plebiscite for the return of any but a small part of Schleswig. Austria conceded practical independence and equality within the dual empire to Hungary. The United States won the sovereignty over Cuba from Spain and then restored it to the Cuban people.

Besides these rather unusual and radical applications of the peace-method, there are a number of its forms which have become increasingly familiar and habitual in the settlement of disputes among nations. Among these may be mentioned good offices and mediation, conciliation, commissions of inquiry, arbitration, international conferences, international courts, and world associations.

Mediation is where one government, friendly with two others which are in dispute, extends its good offices to them to see if it can aid in the peaceful settlement of the dispute between them. If this offer is accepted by both parties to the dispute, then the other government mediates between them by suggesting various peaceful ways in which the dispute might be settled. The first Hague Conference endorsed this method, and the governments represented at that conference unanimously declared that any nation, because of its own interest in the preservation of the world's peace, has a complete right to extend its good offices in this way, and that such extension shall never be considered an

act unfriendly to either disputant, even though hostilities may have begun between them and one of them may have gained military victories over the other. The American government has successfully extended its good offices and mediated many times between various republics of South and Central America;¹ it has also accepted the mediation of South American governments between itself and Mexico. The frightful Russo-Japanese War of 1904-06 was brought to an end in the Peace of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, largely through the good offices and mediation of the United States. In European history, also, the efficacy of good offices and mediation has been tried and proved on many occasions when the disputant or belligerent nations were willing to listen to the voice of moderation and reason.

Conciliation, offered by one disputant nation to another, or by one or more neutral governments between two disputant or warring ones, has also achieved noteworthy victories of peace. The ten years' war between Stephen of Blois and Henry II of Anjou for the throne of England was ended by the conciliatory agreement that Stephen should retain the throne during his lifetime and that Henry should succeed him. The Highland Clans accepted the olive branch held out to them by William III, and their members became henceforth loyal servants of the British crown. The conciliation of the Welsh and Irish, and of the Indian tribes in colonial Rhode Island, Georgia and Pennsylvania, led to noteworthy triumphs of the peace-method. President Washington's conciliatory measures with Great Britain (our recent foe) and Spain, during the French Revolution, prevented America from being drawn into the cataclysmic wars of Europe. President John Adams' conciliatory measures with the government of the French Directory put an end to the war between the infant American and French republics. The dispute between Sweden and Finland over the possession of the Aland Islands, which were strategically and economically important to both of them, was settled through

¹ The recent Tacna-Arica agreement is an important example.

the conciliatory action of the Council of the League of Nations.

International commissions of inquiry are another efficient form of the peace-method. They were warmly endorsed by the first Hague Conference of 1899, which was just too late for their use in settling the question of whether or not the Spanish government was responsible for the blowing up of the United States cruiser, *Maine*, in Havana Harbour in 1898. If an impartial, international commission of inquiry could have fixed the blame for that catastrophe, it is quite probable that there would have been no war between Spain and the United States in that year, especially as the Spanish government had expressed its willingness to surrender its sovereignty over Cuba. An international commission of inquiry did prevent a war between Russia and Great Britain in 1905, when Russia was fighting Great Britain's ally, Japan, and when a Russian fleet attacked and sank some English fishing-boats off the Dogger Bank. The use of this form of the peace-method would have been peculiarly appropriate in 1914, when the Serbian government was accused by Austria of having been implicated in the murder of the Austrian archduke. An impartial investigation of facts and a publication of the truth makes so powerful an appeal to the public opinion of the world that it can be depended upon, when thus enlightened and aroused, to prevent belligerent governments from making an appeal to arms. Investigate before you fight, and in nine times out of ten you will not fight at all: such is the wise counsel of international commissions of inquiry, and it is based upon the fundamental principle that when you know the truth, the truth will set you free from prejudice and passion.

International arbitration is also richly justified by reason and experience. There are many instances in ancient and mediæval times of the successful arbitration of disputes between nations. The modern history of arbitration begins with the Jay Treaty between Great Britain and the United States in 1794; and during the next 150 years there were

726 treaties of arbitration (plus 1485 under Article XII of the Covenant of the League of Nations), and 264 disputes settled by arbitral tribunals, more than seventy of these having been participated in by the United States. So successful had these temporary tribunals been, that the first Hague Conference of 1899 established an International *Court of Arbitration*, which has settled eighteen disputes. Some of these disputes were participated in by the Great Powers,—the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, Italy and Japan,—all of whom came before the international court and loyally accepted its decisions. Several of these disputes were of grave importance, and one of them was between Germany and France in connection with their rivalry in Morocco.

So successful has been this International Court of Arbitration in settling all the disputes brought before it, that the nations are now developing an International Court of Justice, which has been established on the initiative of the League of Nations, and has already handed down fifteen opinions, judicial or advisory. The great advantage of this court over the former one is that it is designed to be always in session and, for this and other reasons, to attract more and more disputes to its jurisdiction, so that the nations may contract the *habit* of invariably submitting their differences to settlement by a court and thus of refraining from an appeal to trial by battle. It is greatly to be hoped that, through the agency of a permanent commission of inquiry and reference, or by permitting the court itself to take jurisdiction over a case when only *one* party to it presents it for trial, the court will be given the chance to settle *all* disputes which may arise between nations.¹ At present, there is a

¹ The Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, established in 1921 at The Hague, contains an optional clause (Article 36) which provides that all "legal" (as distinguished from "political") disputes between countries which accept it shall be submitted to the court at the instance of only one party to it, without awaiting the consent, as in ordinary voluntary arbitration, of the other party or parties. Forty-three states have accepted this clause, including Germany, France, Britain and Italy.

theory that questions of "vital interest" and "national honour" cannot be settled by a court, but must be reserved for trial by battle. The fallacy and absurdity as well as the wickedness of this theory become plain when it is subjected to the light of reason and experience. The *Alabama* dispute and the Venezuela dispute between the United States and Great Britain involved questions both of vital interests and of national honour; and yet tribunals of arbitration settled them easily and permanently and brushed away with the sweep of a pen all further danger of an imminent resort to the sword.

These various forms of the peace-method had met with such notable success between nations when adopted by two or three of them, that it was decided in 1899 to bring the official representatives of all the nations together in a world conference for the limitation of armaments and the development of pacific settlement. The first Hague Conference of that year, the second Hague Conference of 1907, the Paris Conference of 1919, the Washington Conference of 1921-22, and the annual sessions of the Assembly of the League of Nations, have been the outstanding international conferences devoted to the making and maintenance of peace. Aside from the specific achievements of these conferences, it has been a splendid thing to assemble the official representatives of the entire world in a single room, around a table where they can discuss their ideals and difficulties face to face and enable the world's public opinion to beat in upon their deliberations and accelerate their progress away from war and toward permanent peace.

The second Hague Conference planned the automatic and regular meeting of its successors, but the World War intervened to prevent this; and when the Paris Conference met to make peace at the end of the World War, it adopted a League of Nations, the chief feature of which was an International Assembly. This Assembly meets regularly and discusses many problems of world politics. As a forum of discussion and a focus of world opinion and world influence,

this Assembly is invaluable. Unfortunately, it is not attended by representatives of the nations which have not yet become members of the League. So essential is it in the development of the peace-method of our time, that it must be made a world-wide assembly or conference, either by so amending the Covenant of the League of Nations that all nations will become members, or by reviving the Conferences at The Hague and merging the League's Assembly in them.

These international conferences are a long step toward that Association of Nations which has been for centuries the dream of seers and sages. Three centuries ago, Henry IV of France proposed the formation of a Christian Republic, in which all the states of Europe should be bound together for the maintenance of peace. And twenty centuries before that, the states of Greece formed their religious amphictyones for a similar purpose. These leagues and others, like the so-called "Holy Alliance" of Europe in the nineteenth century, were unfortunately leagues to *enforce* "peace" by military coercion. Such enforcement of true peace is a contradiction in terms and a physical and moral impossibility. Under the shadow of the World War, the founders of the League of Nations felt compelled to base their league also upon the military or economic coercion of recalcitrant states, and thus they led the world temporarily upon the wrong road,—the road which leads to more war and continued preparations for war. The United States could not forsake or betray the voluntary principle upon which is founded the Union of our forty-eight sovereign States; it could not therefore become a member of the League of Nations, which it has regarded, in the light of Articles 8, 10, 11 and 16 of its Covenant, as a coercive alliance. Fortunately, there are many signs that, with the gradual disappearance of the aftermath of the World War,—its fears, hatred, and reliance upon brute force,—the nations both within and outside of the League of Nations are finding their way back to the path of non-coercive

association upon which the United States and the Hague Conferences have pursued their successful and beneficent careers. The time is surely coming when *all* the nations will again join together upon that path and renew their united efforts to provide for the maintenance of peace by purely peaceful means and for the promotion of the world's welfare by friendly coöperation.

Meanwhile, various efforts have been made by the advocates of the peace-method to curb the evils and the scope of war. The ancient Greeks attacked the use of poison in wells and other barbarities in the prosecution of war. Hugo Grotius strove, amidst the unspeakable cruelties and atrocities of the Thirty Years' War, to found a science, that of International Law, which should mitigate the brutalities of war and guide the international activities of peace. The Geneva Conventions of 1864, 1868 and 1906, applied the Red Cross Rules to the prosecution of land and naval warfare, hoping thereby to mitigate man's inhumanity to man on the field of battle. The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 carried further this effort to canalize and humanize warfare, to restrain its scope and its practices to rational and moderate limits.

But, from the time of the introduction of gunpowder to the invention of the dreadnoughts, submarines, aeroplanes, big guns, high explosives and poisonous gases of to-day, the advance of the physical sciences has placed in the hands of combatants weapons of an increasingly deadly and devastating kind. The enormous scale, too, upon which modern wars are fought, involving as they do the entire economic, political and intellectual life of whole populations, has made the "rules of warfare" a mere name, a mere scrap of paper, a mere nothing. Hence, men of vision have turned their minds toward more effective methods of curbing war itself by getting rid of it altogether.

To protect certain smaller nations from its ravages, they have tried the "neutralization" of such little lands as Belgium, Switzerland and Luxemburg, pledging their big

neighbours in their wars with one another to refrain from violating the territory, and to guarantee the inviolability, of the neutralized states, these in turn promising to abstain from offensive warfare and from membership in military alliances. So-called "military necessity," however, has disregarded mutual pledges and everything else in its struggle for speedy and complete "victory."

To prevent lands and peoples from being annexed by victors, and thus to remove one strong incentive to war, the device of self-determination by means of a plebiscite, or popular vote on the transfer of sovereignty, has been demanded and in some instances applied. Danish Slesvig, German Silesia, Peruvian Tacna and Arica are recent instances of plebiscites held or promised. But the greed and the economic needs of the victor are such that this fundamental right of communities to control their own allegiance is more often denied than observed. There are numerous outstanding instances to-day where the disregard of a people's right to a plebiscite carries with it the seeds of war. The Alsace-Lorraines of many lands will precipitate future wars, unless this right of self-determination is recognized as being based on elementary justice and is conceded ere it is too late.

A still more drastic ally of the peace-method would be a unanimous declaration on the part of governments and nations that war shall no longer be regarded by international law as a right of sovereign states, but that it shall be outlawed and branded as a crime, in and of itself, as well as against God and humanity. The "wager of battle" between individuals within nations was branded by the state as a crime and those who insisted upon resorting to it were gradually treated as criminals. England led the way in this great reform, in the Twelfth Century, and France followed the example in the Thirteenth. Since the World War, the people of several nations, as for example in Bulgaria, Greece and Germany, have applied this same medicine to their former rulers who led them into disastrous wars, and

have tried and punished many of them as "war-criminals." But the tendency has developed only so far at present as to regard unsuccessful war as a crime against the people who suffer defeat. What is needed is the branding of all war, successful or unsuccessful and for whatever purpose, as a crime both against the people who were led into it and against humanity as a whole. This step will doubtless be taken unanimously in an international conference at no distant date. Already, at the invitation of the United States, fifty-three nations have solemnly and mutually pledged one another to renounce war in the future as an *instrument of national policy*, and resort to no other than *peaceful means* of settling all disputes of whatever character or origin they may be!

Meanwhile, a determined movement is on foot to strike at great, growing and competitive armaments as a prime cause of war and as the chief obstacle to the peace-method in all its forms. As a cause of war, and *not* as "a preservative of peace," big armaments stand revealed in all their hideous nakedness. For a generation before the World War, the European "barracks philosophy of peace" was accepted almost universally, and huge armies, great fleets, mountains of ammunition, and universal compulsory military training and service were feverishly built up and were confidently relied upon to prevent any nation from starting a war. Such frontiers as the Rhineland, the Austrian Alps and the Mazurian Lakes were studded with "impregnable" fortresses and bristled with "invincible" guns, and were thus supposed to be maintaining the peace between the countries separated by them.

Every scintilla of reason was dead against this preposterously foolish philosophy, and from America had come the testimony of Argentina and Chile, the United States and Canada, as the argument of experience in favour of mutual disarmament as the best guarantee of peace. But the mad increase of armaments in every form and on every element,—land, water and air,—went on with unprecedented speed

and expense, always justified of course in the name of "preserving the peace." After a dozen years of most desperate arming *against* war, there came the worst war in human history, and together with the statesmen, even some generals and admirals gave up their foolish philosophy of peace,—at least for a time.

Meanwhile, the "preservation of peace by preparing for war" was seen to be the prime obstacle to a resort to the real methods of peace. Good offices, mediation, conciliation, commissions of inquiry, conferences, arbitration, international courts, were one and all scornfully rejected by disputant governments whose army, or fleet, or military alliance, was "ready to fight at the drop of the hat" and was regarded as the "invincible" agency by means of which alone "justice" could be secured and "peace" be maintained. On the eve of the World War, people everywhere were anxiously demanding that the war should be prevented by a resort to one or other of the peace-methods which had been so painfully developed; and when these were rejected without being given even a trial, people everywhere became for a time skeptical of their value. But when the military armaments, which had been even more painfully developed, were mobilized and the world came at last to realize their immensity and character, there was no longer reason to wonder that the peace-method, eclipsed as it was by their enormity, had not been permitted to function.

The armaments were given full swing during four years of titanic war; but when the sad, stricken world looked around upon its ruins at the end of the war, it made up its mind that war was indeed hell, and that armaments had carried it to hell, both by providing an immediate resort to the military method and by preventing the peace-method from being tried. It therefore determined that the curse and the menace of armaments should cease. But, alas for human hopes! The war had bred such a brood of fear, hatred and revenge, such a pessimism as to the effectiveness of any moral sanction, such a despairing clinging to the old chains

of militarism, that the clash of arms had no sooner ceased before another great struggle for the increase of armaments was found to be under way. Ten years after the "war to end war and preparation for war," there are larger armies maintained than before the war, and the "colonials" of vast empires are being recruited, trained and equipped for war in Europe; great fleets of cruisers, submarines and battle-planes have been built up; the utmost ingenuity and most advanced chemical and mechanical knowledge are being devoted to the invention and control of the deadliest poisons and the most effective devices for destroying large communities of non-combatants; France is building up a ring of alliances around Germany and against Russia, financing land armaments among Europe's small powers, and assuming Germany's former "predominant" position in Europe; the armaments-makers and ship-builders of Great Britain and the United States are supplying small belligerents like Greece and Turkey with naval and aerial forces, and aiding as much as in them lies to promote the armaments competition among them.

All this spells inevitable war. In 1921, American and British statesmen realized that if a stop was not put to the renewed armaments race, a brood of little wars would continue to afflict Europe, and finally merge into another conflagration; and that an even more gigantic war was looming up in the Pacific and the Far East. They accordingly convened the Washington Conference, in 1921-22, which succeeded in greatly reducing and limiting naval armaments, in fixing a ratio of naval strength among the great powers, in checking fortifications and naval bases in the Pacific, in abrogating the Anglo-Japanese alliance, in settling some dangerous causes of dispute in regard to China, and in providing for future conference for the settlement of new causes of danger and dispute.

An attempt was also made at the Washington Conference to reduce and limit land armaments, as well as naval; but this was blocked by the opposition of France, which also

opposed the outlawing or drastic restriction of submarines. Hence, the completion of the task of disarmament,—of reducing national armaments to the status of genuine national police forces, and of prohibiting their use for the coercion of other nations,—this task still remains before us. Its complete achievement is an essential prerequisite to success both in preventing an appeal to arms, and in enabling the various forms of the peace-method to function. Already, in the first year of President Hoover's administration, he and Ramsay MacDonald, the Premier of Great Britain, have held up the building of new war-ships which the "big navy" promoters had forced upon both countries, and are looking forward to another conference which shall strike another blow at naval armaments, and shall pave the way for the disarmament of all the world. Practically all the world has adopted the Kellogg Pact for substituting the peace-method for war; hence, disarmament is not only logical, but necessary, if the pact is to be observed.

Parallel with the solution of the armaments problem, there must go on the development of the various forms of the peace-method which constitute an efficient substitute for war. The substitution of law for war within nations has many striking illustrations. Henry II's substitution of jury trial for trial by battle; the legal and economic abolition of serfdom and villeinage, after terrible peasant revolts had attempted it in vain; the widening of popular suffrage and representation in England by parliamentary statute, instead of by violent revolution; the abolition of State armies and navies and the substitution of the Supreme Court within the United States of America: these and many other achievements of law versus war plainly point to the path which must be followed between and among nations, as well as within nations, if the peace-method is to attain its goal of permanent peace and reasoned justice.

As great allies of the peace-method, also, must be sedulously cultivated the already extensive economic, scientific and humanitarian coöperation among the nations; and an

internationalized education of youths and adults in every land, which shall teach the truth about every other people and give due credit and gratitude to them for their respective contributions to civilization and the world's welfare. On such a basis of mutual helpfulness, and of mutual knowledge and appreciation, there will be founded a mutual respect and friendship which will cause the exclusive use of the peace-method in the nations' dealings with one another to be regarded as natural and beneficent as is the sunrise, and the threat of a resort to or preparation for the war-method as hateful and iniquitous as are the evil deeds of the Prince of Darkness.

When the student of the long history of humanity dispassionately compares the achievements of the war-method with those of the peace-method, he finds as great a discrepancy between them as there is between "the conquerors" and the truly great leaders of our race. Ramses, Sargon, Sennacherib, Jenghis Khan, Tamerlane, Attila: these are but names, and their resounding deeds after having soaked the earth in human blood have crumbled into dust; while the deeds of Buddha, Zoroaster, Lao-Tse, Confucius, Manu, Hammurabi, Moses, Jesus Christ, have wielded a lasting and beneficent power across the gulf of centuries and inspired the highest ideals and the conduct of every-day life among myriads of people. Even such men as Cyrus, Darius, Cæsar, Theodoric, Charlemagne, Alfred, Napoleon, Washington, Lincoln, live not in their military achievements, but in the constructive use which they made of the peace-method of their time for promoting the true prosperity and lasting welfare of their people. What are the victories of the Greeks over the Ægeans and Persians, in comparison with the marvellous products of art, literature and philosophy which sprang from the Greek genius inspired by the old Ægean and Asiatic culture? The Hebrew prophets and Christian apostles who spent their lives in sowing to the spirit have found eternal life here as well as in heaven; while their military contemporaries

have followed their short-lived triumphs into the limbo of unimportant and forgotten things. The Teutonic "conquerors" of the Roman Empire bowed before the majesty of Roman law and were transformed by the civilization of the people whom they "conquered." Rome, the proud mistress of the Mediterranean world, called herself because of her military supremacy the "Eternal City"; but when she went down before the Gothic hosts, the Christians whom she had persecuted erected upon her ruins their own "City of God" in the form of the Christian Church. The Turks who captured Constantinople from the Eastern Roman Empire little dreamed in the pride of their military glory that they had expelled a group of Greek scholars who would give such an impulse to the Renaissance in Western Europe that a new epoch of history would begin, and that such a new impulse would be given to Western progress as would utterly check and eclipse the Crescent of Mohammedan conquest and culture. Again, all the wars that were ever fought are insignificant, historically, in comparison with the peaceful revolutions in industry and politics which transformed the Western world in the Nineteenth Century, and are now transforming the East. Peace hath her victories in the past far more renowned than those of war; and the peace-method *must* triumph in the future over the war-method, both within and among the nations!



Kes
Ap 18 '34

D 12 '34

Ap 23 '38

N 26 '42

MAY 3 1948

MAY 17 1948

MAY 17 1948

DE 14 '56
JA 4 '60

OCT 11 '30

48598

JX
1938
H8

JX1938 .H8
Hull, William Isaac,
The war-method and the peace-m

c.1

080101 000



3 9308 00100402 9

EARLHAM COLLEGE LIBRARIES